

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01909140 4





*M. Mungovan*





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



JESUS THE SON OF MARY,

OR

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

UPON

THE INCARNATION

OF

GOD THE SON.



JESUS THE SON OF MARY,  
OR  
THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH  
UPON  
THE INCARNATION  
OF  
GOD THE SON,  
CONSIDERED  
IN ITS BEARINGS UPON THE REVERENCE  
SHEWN BY CATHOLICS  
TO  
HIS BLESSED MOTHER.

*Jan'y 8/1898*  
BY THE *M. Munrovan*  
*St Michael's College*  
REV. JOHN BRANDE MORRIS, M.A. *Toronto*  
*but*

SOMETIME PETREAN FELLOW OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD;  
AND NOW ONE OF THE PROFESSORS AT PRIOR PARK.

---

"De justo Patre secundum Divinam, et de justâ Matre secundum humanam  
naturam, justus ab ipsâ origino Christus natus est."

*S. Anselm. Cantuar. de Conc. Virg cap. xx.*

---

VOL. II.

---

LONDON:  
JAMES TOOVEY, PICCADILLY.  
1851.

JUN - 6 1955

## CONTENTS.

---

### CHAP. IV.

#### THE PRESENTATION OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR IN THE TEMPLE.

1. Reasons for asserting, that the Magi came after the Purification.
2. Objectors say, the Purification was improper, unless Mary was a sinner.
3. Yet, on the same foot, the baptism of repentance was improper, unless Christ was a sinner.
4. Prudence dictated to Mary, to avoid the appearance of singularity.
5. View of the bystanders of the Presentation.
6. The part of Simeon's words which relates to Mary, considered here.
- 7, 8. How the love of Mary reveals the thoughts of the heart, and proves if it is a heart of flesh, or of stone.
9. Anna's prophecy probably not public.
10. The visit to Egypt, why bidden by an Angel to St. Joseph, and not to Mary.
11. Uncertainty of its duration. (Sister Emerich's visions.)
12. Ancient tradition concerning it.
13. Gratitude, as described by Cicero, would give the Holy Family a good-will to Egypt.

### CHAP. V.

#### THE DISCOVERY OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE, AFTER HE HAD BEEN LOST.

1. The present non-enjoyment of faculties does not disprove their existence.
2. It is not obvious, how the duty of honouring his Father obliged Christ to deprive his Mother of the present enjoyment of her usual gifts.

3. The supposition, that Mary was subject to the law of habits, helps to explain this.

4, 5. Our Lord may have been employed in giving first grace to some of the doctors.

6. The authority of his parents over Jesus brought out to all generations by his conduct.

7. Meaning of the Greek text discussed, as to those Jesus was occupied with.

8. Why this was to Mary a joyful mystery.

9. Meaning of Mary keeping all these matters in her heart.

10. Mode in which Jesus was subject to his parents.

10.\*Thoughts the Angels may be conceived to feel in the house of Loretto.

11. Christ must have given Mary opportunities of gaining a habit of suffering,

12. And habits of commanding himself.

13. The objection, that the laws applicable to other men, are not so to Christ,

14. Proves nothing, since the habit of commanding remains in Mary.

15. Passages from Cyril and Augustine, to shew that the habit of reverence in Jesus is not destroyed at the marriage feast.

16. Seeming acts of irreverence do not unsay a whole life of reverence, but may be reconciled with it.

17. The protracted obedience at Nazareth intelligible, if Mary was to hold a preeminent place in the scheme of redemption.

## CHAP. VI.

### THE AGONY OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR IN THE GARDEN.

1. He who submits to a superior, submits to a created will, even if that will is always moved by the Holy Ghost.

2. Christ commonly made by Catholics to submit it to his Mother, whether he should be crucified.

3. If his submission for thirty years was not foolish, then neither was his submission about the most important act of his life foolish.

4. It is only protestant prepossessions against the state of obedience which make it appear so.

5. Justification of the assertion, that Christ learned obedience by what he suffered at Nazareth.

6. Mary's opportunities at Nazareth for learning the details of the Passion.

7. Her previous loss of Christ, would lead to enquire into these details.

8. Even if she had at the time *no* supernatural means of knowing them, her previous natural ones were sufficient.

9. Christ in his agony knew how heretical doctors would blaspheme Mary and the Saints who laud her.

10—12. Mary having in his teaching and miracles been always before his mind, would naturally occur to it in his Agony.

13. What may be said of the Agony, applies to the scourging and crowning with thorns.

14. Mary might wish to contemplate Christ's sufferings with her senses, even if divinely informed of them in her mind.

15. Our Lord's Agony, if contemplated, shews the desire of such actual sight of Jesus to be natural.

16. And her doubt at the Crucifixion to her honour, not to her dishonour.

## CHAP. VII.

### UPON THE CRUCIFIXION.

1. As in Eve all die, even so in Mary shall all be made alive.

2. Concordant view of contemplatists, *a* rule to others.

3. The active Crucifixion of Christ.

4. And what Mary saw during it.

5. Her supernatural constancy under the sight of it;

6. Exhibited in, what St. Ephrem attributes to her prayers, the penitent thief's conversion.

7. The alternations of calm and agony at the will as of Jesus, so of Mary. St. John's Angelic office.

8. The division of the Garments, and Mary's feelings thereon.

## CHAP. VIII.

### THE CRUCIFIXION CONTINUED.

1. Neither the natural qualifications of the beloved disciple,

2. Nor the supernatural, fit him for his office at the Crucifixion,

3. Without some special grace.
4. Incarnate Love did not call him to his death-bed without predestinating Wisdom.
5. The feelings of the rabble, as they saw John and Mary, depicted.
6. Some protestants share the rabble's feeling, but not their excuse: passage from Origen on John's sonship to Mary.
7. Mary instated then in the office, which her life with Christ had given her habits for.
8. How Christ made Mary John's Mother, seeing her womb was 'shut for the Prince,' and he could not enter into it.
9. How Christ's own power is exalted by what he then did for Mary.
10. The awful condition of those who die without acknowledging Mary's Maternity:
11. Alleviated in some measure by considering the care shewn by a mother to a babe in its brute half-conscious state.
12. Christ's Agony supplies a clue to a passage of Cyril, touching Mary's need of St. John.
13. St. John could remember many things naturally calculated to comfort Mary.
14. But the might of the Eucharist, as set forth by SS. Leo and Cyril, may have supernaturally fitted him for his office.
15. Devotion to the Sacred Blood first taught by Mary in John's house.
16. Votive conclusion.

## CHAP. IX.

### UPON THE RESURRECTION.

1. Scripture does not assert what Catholics do, that Christ appeared first to his Mother.
2. Objection from the non-assertion of this in Fathers, and assertion of the contrary in St. Mark.
3. Meanings which may be put upon St. Mark's ascription of first appearances to the Magdalene.
4. Professional visits of the great Physician of doubts distinguished from others.
5. Recorded appearances have relation to those who doubt.
- 7, 8. Jesus naturally with Mary when not with his disciples.
9. Proximity to Christ's flesh at that time a source of grace to her.



10. Mary neither commanded without respect, nor prayed without authority.
11. Her influence with Christ illustrated from St. Monica's with St. Austin.
12. Jesus may have done acts of Dulia to Mary then.
13. Brief notice of Mary's life after the Resurrection.
14. Mary's dignity displays her treasures.

## CHAP. X.

## PROTESTANT OBJECTIONS TO THE FOREGOING DOCTRINE.

1. 'Mariolatry' not consistent with the Bible and early Church.
2. The office of the Devil's Advocate performed in this chapter.
3. Of the kind of objections here treated.
4. Duty of securing sufficient belief.
5. He who is called in question on devotion to Mary, is called also upon the Incarnation.
6. A mode of testing the earnestness of an objector suggested.
7. Paucity of weighty objections.
8. Division of objections.
9. Objections from the silence of Scripture.
10. Objections from antiquity : 'Mariolatry' not ancient.
11. Sermons and commentaries of ancient writers omit Mary, where Romanists force her on our notice.
12. The Romish Church uses spurious sermons to deceive with.
13. Idle to reply that this is only arguing from a negative.
14. St. Chrysostome no Mariolater.
15. Pius the Ninth would say of Mary, what St. Leo does of Peter.
16. The pretended Areopagite scarcely mentions her.
17. St. Austin does not mention her, where his argument required it.
18. Even St. Cyril himself uses language of Mary, which Petavius calls impious and intolerable.
19. The Liturgies, by praying for, shew they thought her a sinner, and in purgatory.
20. There is one instance, and one only, of her being invoked in genuine works of early authors.

## CHAP. XI.

## MODES OF MEETING THE FOREGOING OBJECTIONS.

1. A practical answer sufficient.
2. Those Fathers who are cited invoke the Saints, and so the objector should invoke them.
3. Even a speculative answer leaves the question at issue a practical one.
4. Reasons for considering if the objector's conclusion is substantiated by his arguments.
5. The temper of Protestantism biasses it about those arguments drawn from Scripture.
6. Protestantism not like Scripture in calling Mary 'Blessed,' Catholics like it.
7. Nor in explaining Simeon's prophecy;
8. Or the types and prophecies,
9. And allegories of the Old Testament.
- 10, 11. Reasons for the silence of the New Testament about Mary.
12. Objection, 'that she is in the New Testament a modest retiring Virgin,' refutes itself.
13. Objection from the silence of Scripture, even when not overstated, forgets that there is Tradition besides.
14. That from the silence of Tradition is special pleading for nature against grace.
15. St. Epiphanius forbids giving *Latria* to Mary, as the Collyridians did,
16. Which Manicheans charged Catholics with doing to Martyrs, and St. Austin denies,
17. And thereby gives the rule of which St. Epiphanius furnishes an example.
18. The Ever-virginity, the Theotocos, and the miraculous Nativity, not things familiar to protestants.
19. General answer to the objection from the silence of antiquity.
20. Scripture sanctions the principle of considering the present capacity of the audience.
21. Religion, considered as the property of the multitude, can only be implanted by degrees.
22. The public preaching, &c. of the ancients influenced by that fact.

## CHAP. XII.

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN REPLY TO OBJECTIONS.

1. 'Roman' doctrine, *if* it exceeds, does not discard ancient Catholic teaching.

2. Polemical works of the ancients more clear on Mary's privileges than didactical.

3. Dishonesty of mind in those who pretermitt the view arising from the whole of the passages given.

4. Damascene and Maximus state strongly the doctrine of the present Church on the Com-passion and Integrity of Mary.

5. The Apostle of England sides with the present Church.

6. St. Peter Chrysologus attributes power to the name, and to the Com-passion of Mary.

7. St. Epiphanius and Ephrem make her the Mother of all living.

8. Theodotus, Jerome, and Nazianzen speak of her preeminent sanctity.

9. St. Austin holds her up to Nuns, as the source and pattern of the state of virginity.

10. St. Ambrose ascribes a singular sanctity to her.

11. St. James of Nisibis makes her destroy the works of the devil.

12. St. Irenæus lays a stress upon her consent to the Incarnation as of the cause of our Redemption.

13. These passages make it morally certain, that they would prefer modern Romanism to Protestantism.

14. The whole bias of the Fathers must decide the question, not single passages.

15. Protestants virtually object to the whole notion of creatures being mediators at all, which the very Fathers, who create the difficulties, most strongly assert.

16. St. Chrysostom's expressions have no solution known to the writer.

17. Usefulness of such avowals to those out and to those never out of the Church.

18. Pseudo-Dionysius dismissed, as Hypatius did, when heretics first used him.

19. Needlessness of anxiety about the doctors of grace and the Incarnation.

20. Statement of the difference of Latria and Dulia from Cyril

21. Taken in connection with his way of speaking of Mary, finds him guilty of Popery.

22. St. Austin's explicit denial, that the Saints are prayed for in the Liturgies.

23. Among these, Mary having the first place, must have had it in the hearts of the faithful.

24. Mary of Egypt converted through a picture of Mary: one of St. Peter's disciples very devout to her.

## CHAP. XIII.

### OF THE EVIDENCE OF VISIONS, MIRACLES, AND ALLEGORIES.

1. St. Peter's quotation from Joel proves that all supernatural gifts might be expected in the Church.

2. The evidence here spoken of sufficient ground for reason to receive the faith, though not for faith to make dogmas upon.

3. Their existence contemplated in Joel, and believed in the Church. St. Austin calls them 'usual.'

4. Cyril uses one to confirm a dogmatic fact. The Council of Ephesus reveres, and Julian abhors them.

5. St. John Chrysostom uses them to enforce the doctrine of the Real Presence.

6. St. Antony gives explicit rules for discerning spirits in them.

7. Origen combats Celsus and reasons scientifically, about them.

8. St. Cyprian rates those who despise them.

9. Those who thus esteemed visions could not have made light of visions relating to our Lady.

10. The declarations of visionaries and of doctors to be measured by rules similar, but not identical,

11. Are subject to similar difficulties,

12. And to similar apparent contradictions.

13. The objection, that they are chiefly given to women, if true, may be answered from analogy.

14. Nothing in Scripture against their evidence, but much for it.

15. Analogy of the faith the only *a priori* test upon the subject.

16. The objection, that at this rate a wholly new revelation may come, out of place in those who make it;
17. And idle against those who in claiming visions claim only a *confirmation* of pre-existing conclusions.
18. Miracles reducible to the same rules.
19. Allegorical Fathers favour devotion to Mary.
20. Instances to shew that allegories are also reducible to the same rules.
21. It cannot reasonably be urged that allegorical interpretation is antichristian because Jewish,
22. Or Pagan; Pagan allegory, in what unlike and in what like Christian.
23. Reasons for thinking God *intended* us to use allegory.
- 24, 25. Some doctrines taught by Scripture only in allegorical language.
26. Allegory only dangerous when used to create, not when to confirm, doctrine.
27. The selection of four Gospels out of many used to illustrate this power of allegory.
28. The testimony of several allegories, when coinciding with that of several visions and miracles, a strong probable argument for a doctrine.
29. These three were used to prove Christianity, and so may be used to prove this part of it.
- 30, 31. The argument from consistency furnished in this work will not convince without the will to be convinced.



## PART III.

### ON SOME PREEMINENT PRIVILEGES ATTRIBUTED BY CATHOLICS TO MARY.

---

#### CHAP. I.

##### THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION VIEWED AS EXPLANATORY OF SCRIPTURE.

1. The Immaculate Conception, if true, will make the other high privileges attributed to Mary credible: and

2. Is capable of appearing consistent with them, even to those without.

3. Among the different arguments for the Church, her non-rejection of dogmas once established, is one.

4. Early anticipations will not be clearly such, save to those in the Church.

5. The Immaculate Conception may however be used to those not in it, as a theory which will explain facts.

6. The article THE in Isaiah's prophecy of the Incarnation, a fact of this nature.

7. The Jewish division of Scripture sanctioned by our Lord

8. Presumes the existence of allegories in the historical books.

9. Jahel, and Esther, and Judith, are allegories of our great Redemptrix,

10. Who would be a Virgin, if it can be shewn that she is the promised seed.

11, 12. The context decides that the word 'seed,' which is neuter, belongs to a female.

13. The allegories and this text of Genesis, if taken of Mary, explain why Isaias calls her The Virgin.

14. Gabriel quotes the words used of Jahel to Mary, not accidentally, but on purpose.

15. The meaning of this fact also easily accounted for upon our theory.

16. What Scripture says of other Saints shews, that Mary's was a personal gift from her dutiful Son.



17. Matt. xi. 11. if explained by Scripture usage, does not include Mary in those 'born of women.'

18. Our Lord probably thought at the time of ONE, not the least in the kingdom of Heaven.

19. Sense of the words 'raised up.' The less is blessed by the greater, and John by Mary, from whose visit he received the gift of prophecy.

20. Scripture doctrine of predestination, and passages used by the Church, favour Mary's prerogative.

21. The mention of five women in the genealogy leads the same way.

22. Power, being in the Economy subservient to mercy, the display of it for remote ancestors, is of purpose to observe here.

23. General rules laid down in Scripture must be taken to hold in all cases, unless there is *authority* for exemption in any case.

## CHAP. II.

### THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION VIEWED AS EXPLANATORY OF TEXTS OF THE FATHERS.

1. Difficulties inherent in the historical treatment of a doctrine not practical difficulties to the Catholic Christian.

2. The evidence of the Church's former opinion is probable. Division of the evidence here treated of.

3. What is implied in the objection (*in limine*), that St. Thomas Aquinas rejected the Immunity.

4. Solid reasons for suspecting his works are corrupted.

5, 6. Theory of the preexistence of the body if untrue, yet a useful fiction towards understanding the Immunity.

7. Universally believed by Catholics, the Immunity is not treated here as a mere domestic controversy.

8. But what is said of it, is said with a view to prove its *consistency* with the faith to those without.

9. The Council of Frankfurt may be taken as a point to go back from in tracing the pious belief.

10. The Church opened her mouth there, as of old, in the parable of the 'Virgin Earth,' out of which Adam was made.

11. Other explanations of the parable pass to connatural, not to contradictory ideas.



12. St. Dominic's statement of the same parable noticed.

13. The statement of it in the Epistle on St. Andrew's martyrdom, earlier than the said Council, probably very much earlier.

14. Leading Eastern Bishops contrast the *Blessed* Virgin with the *cursed* ground, and compare her to Eden.

15. If such early statements were ever so vague, so were those about Christ's soul;

16. For texts apparently adverse speak of the flesh of Mary, much as others do of Christ's human nature.

17. The parable might mean more in the closet, than on the housetops it seemed to do.

18. St. Irenæus and others use it in the West.

19. Concealment of Christ from the devil, easily explained by our theory.

20. Other things with these produce the 'effect' on the mind, desired by the Church.

### CHAP. III.

#### OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE DOCTOR OF GRACE TO THE IMMUNITY OF MARY.

1. St. Austin's difficulties in proving the antiquity of his doctrine,

2. Precisely analogous to those we have in proving the Immunity.

3. The expectation, that the Pelagian controversy would elicit clear avowals on the subject not now disappointed.

4. Obscure, as well as plain, statements of so great a doctor worth considering.

5. Minimum of meaning to the honouring of both sexes, which St. Austin often speaks of, not contradictory to the maximum.

6—9. Passages in which either meaning may be found.

10. A question which rises out of these passages started.

11. The silence of Augustine, where it was to his purpose to introduce Mary, if conceived in sin.

12. He was too shrewd to enter again into an irrelevant controversy.

13. By exempting Mary from actual, exempts her from original, sin.

14. In reply to Pelagius' argument, from absence of actual sin to absence of original in the old Saints, St. Austin exempts Mary alone from deceiving herself, in saying she has no sin.

15. His principles prove, that the Mystical Rose had not the canker of original sin.

16. A various reading of the text of St. A. noticed.

17. St. A.'s argument against Pelagius of no weight, unless he makes Mary immaculate.

18. As Pelagius argued from the Bible only, St. Austin denies that it alone will prove the Immunity.

19. Julian aims at representing St. A.'s doctrine of original sin, as transferring Mary into the devil's book.

20. The force of the words, ' *conditio nascendi*.'

21. St. Austin flatly denies, that he transferred Mary to the devil's book :

22. In which he is following St. Ambrose.

## CHAP. IV.

### ANTECEDENT PROBABILITY OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

1. The probability here urged, is that which rises from the *reasonableness* of the Immunity, when other dogmas are seen to be reasonable.

2. Predestination and Free-will, considered apart, reconcilable with the Immunity.

3. The law of habits requires acts of Free-will, and a beginning, proportioned to the habit wanted at the end.

4. Therefore Mary must have had a beginning proportioned to the end she was designed for.

5. Such a beginning as the Immaculate Conception would make it unnecessary to violate this law of habits.

6. The dignity of Maternity so great, as to require the whole of her existence to prepare for it.

7. As Mary in God's sight had this dignity from the first ;

8. As the law of sin had already been in most of its items abrogated in some case ;

9, 10. As the types, and particularly that of Esther, lead one to expect an exemption from this sweeping law ;

11. As Mary herself had been the subject of so many exceptions : the chances are, that God's predestinating love excepted her from this item of the law of sin.

12. Mother and Son are correlatives: both sexes honoured most, when Mary is likest Christ.

13. Christ, the second Adam, first in God's idea of a new creation.

14. An extraordinarily silly objection eluded, by remembering that the Maternity is a personal gift.

15. The objection implies an unconscious propensity to the doctrine of human merit.

## CHAP. V.

### UPON THE TENDENCY OF ALL HERESIES TO MANICHEISM, AND CONSEQUENTLY TO HATRED OF THE IMMUNITY.

1. The doctrine of devils a clue to the feeling of devils.

2. As the Immunity does not jar with the orthodox mean, its jarring with one heretical extreme, or with both, tells in its favour.

3. Excuse for the seeming self-confidence,

4. And disrespectfulness to great names, in such a line of argument.

5. If all heresies tend towards one, and that one specially contradicts the Immunity, all will eventually contradict it.

6. The holy Fathers are not using mere rhetoric, when they of all assert, that they tend to Manicheism.

7. The theory of Dualism, the animating principle of Manicheism.

8. Heresies on the Incarnation here treated of, and that in such order as suits this work.

9. Apollinarianism is palpably Manichean.

10. Heresies of the Monophysite school have the same ultimate issue.

11. Arianism comes by different routes to the same point.

12. Ultra-Arianism being the natural result of all Arianism, is the most palpably Manichean of its three forms.

13. The mode in which Ultra-Arianism tends to establish two contrary first causes.

14. Arianism proper, furnishes principles of exegesis favourable to the same theory.

15. Semi-Arianism likely to come in several ways to the same result.

16. Sabellianism necessitated Manichean theories of the Incarnation.

17. Confirmations of this from sundry considerations.

18. Though opposite errors therefore tend to Dualism, some tend less directly than others.

19. Materialist tendencies of Nestorianism shew the possibility of a Manichean development.

20. The Anti-Monothelite doctrine, that sameness of operation implies sameness of nature,

21. A great clue to the mode in which Nestorians might become Manicheans.

22. Yet both these tend to an agreement with Pelagianism, which is full of Manichean principles.

23. For the denial of original sin cannot be maintained without principles which help the Manicheans;

24. As neither can the Pelagian theory of concupiscence.

25. But the Manichean's belief in the unreality of Christ's flesh will make them adverse to all Mary's privileges.

26. And their theory of a Dualism, on which this denial is based, makes it physically impossible for one conceived from matter to be Immaculate.

## CHAP. VI.

### ON THE OPPOSITION OF PARTICULAR HERESIES TO THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

1. Pelagianism intrinsically opposed to Mary's privilege.

2. Nestorians would abominate a doctrine which took away the distinctiveness of their Christ's privileges.

3, 4. Eutychianism destroys Christ, the Prototype after which Mary was formed.

5. The one compounded nature of the Monophysites does away with all need of the graces of a Mother in substantial with Christ.

6. And the one compounded will of the Monothelites makes it unnecessary that the will to which Christ was subjected, should be elevated as above described.

7. The internal resemblance of Apollinarianism to Arianism is such, that what the Semi-Arian Eusebius said serves to shew how both heresies destroy the Prototype of Mary.

8. Sabellian notions of the Incarnation would also destroy the necessity of Mary's prerogative.

9. Illustration of this line of argument from what Simonides said of the Corinthians.

## CHAP. VII.

### THE CONTROVERSIES ON THE INCARNATION A KEY TO THE CHURCH'S MIND ON THE IMMUNITY.

1. Heresies developed in a certain order, though under God's permission.

2. The original intention of their infernal author disclosed in a fragment of an early Arian writer.

3. God carried on a counter system, displaying by organic increments the Church's mind in regard to Mary.

4. The Monothelite controversy, while it spoke emphatically of Mary's flesh as untainted,

5. Also shewed that a *nature* the same as ours was all Christ needed in his Mother.

6. The apparent fall of Honorius calculated to draw attention to relation of Pelagianism, which gave Christ a will also in the same state as ours to Monothelitism.

7. The emphatical ascription of all, untainted flesh to Mary not Eastern doctrine only, but Western.

8. To shew in what way such a state of the flesh implies one of the soul correlative to it, a theory of the justice of the propagation of sin is mentioned.

9. The words of Anti-Monothelite writers upon one element of Christ's compound Person, taken from Mary, imply something about her soul.

10. Honorius's conduct led men to feel the relationship of the Pelagian, as preparatory, to the Monothelite controversy.

11. St. Maximus's defence of Honorius brings this relationship clearly out.

12. As the purity of Christ's flesh was brought out by the former and that of his will by the latter, the Fathers by this time knew the two were correlatives, and could not extol the flesh of Mary without extolling her soul.

13. The Anti-Monothelite Fathers therefore *paved the way* for the statement made by the Fathers of Frankfurt.



## CHAP. VIII.

## UPON THE ASSUMPTION AND CORONATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

1. The protestant by his notion of 'Monstrat e esse Matrem'
2. Supposes we give Mary the power of commanding her Son under holy obedience.
3. Which notion, however, seems to find some sort of countenance in Scripture.
4. That Mary was in Heaven, to be obeyed, was believed before St. Methodius's time.
5. And is implied by a western writer speaking of the same passage of Scripture.
6. However, this only proves her soul was there: other proof wanted for the body.
7. An early notion of St. John's Assumption,
8. And of that of the dead bodies of the Saints, shews that early Christians saw nothing incredible in the Assumption.
9. Passage in Pseudo-Dionysius mentioned: the belief really founded on the testimony of the living Church;
10. Which, though its contrary be revolting, is not *de fide*.
11. Other things which tend to make it credible to reason, noticed.
12. Habits in our Saviour's mind require external circumstances suited to them, which the presence of Mary's flesh would supply.
13. Under certain limits Christ may be spoken of as still venerating Mary.
14. Brief mention of Mary's Coronation.

## CHAP. IX.

## OF THE NATURE OF OUR BLESSED LADY'S INTERCESSION.

1. Natural desire of those without to know what sort of veneration we suppose Christ pays to Mary now.
2. Pre-requisites to forming an idea on this subject.
3. i. The Church in authoritative documents makes her Queen of Heaven.
4. And denies that Mary, as Mary, should not be revered.
5. ii. Christ's acts of *Dulia* upon earth must be understood before we can form that idea.

6. They are clearly stated in Cardinal Lugo's words.
7. And an inference made by him from that statement.
8. It is made by him to depend upon the possession of an inferior nature.
9. Such acts of Dulía as interfere with Christ's mediatorial office, were not practised by him even upon earth.
10. Those acts which he did practise must have left habits of religious reverence in his soul.
11. The mere expression 'Command thy Son,' means nothing blasphemous, save when viewed apart from things all Catholics hold and feel.
12. Christ still retaining his human nature may be still capable by ROYAL CONDESCENSION of acts of Dulía.
13. The malice of telling ignorant people this, without telling other and qualifying statements.
14. Illustration from the Angel's reverence for St. John's Apostolic office and sanctity.
15. The different kinds of heavenly Latría in Christ.
16. His earthly Latría has the same difficulties as his earthly Dulía.
17. The objection to saying, 'Jesus, pray for me,' or, 'Mary, command thy Son,' arises chiefly from the intense feeling against so saying in all Catholics.
- 18, 19. Conclusion.





## CHAP. IV.

### THE PRESENTATION OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR IN THE TEMPLE.

1. IT is highly probable, that the visit of the Magians did not take place till after the Purification. For the moment the Magi had gone, it became necessary to escape into Egypt, in order to anticipate the intentions which Herod had already formed: and St. Matthew's account renders it next to certain, that the dreams of the Magi and St. Joseph happened on the same night. The Magi found him not in the manger, but in a house, and consequently they came after the concourse of people was gone, and there were houses to be had in Bethlehem; and after sufficient time had elapsed since the Child's birth, to allow them to come from a distant country, (be that country what it may, for this bears little or nothing on our Lady's dignity<sup>a</sup>.) Now the Purification itself, if the circumstances of it, as is very unlikely, got known to Herod, would have roused suspicion: still as it must have been done at the proper time, that is, forty days after the Nativity, it would follow that the Magi came after that time. Otherwise the stay in Egypt would have prevented the Purification taking place at the right time. For

<sup>a</sup> Matt. ii. 11—14. Trombelli has a vast display of learning upon this subject in his twenty-second and twenty-third Dissertations. The observations, which seem to me of principal importance, I have incorporated in the text: they will be found in vol. iii. p. 439—42. of his work on our Lady.

when the suspicions of Herod had been once awakened, then and not till then a couple of paupers, come from Bethlehem with a young Child with them, would increase them. Spies might be stationed in the temple or elsewhere, to catch up every thing which could bring to light the object of the Magians' inquiry. Simeon and Anna to Herod would probably seem doting old people: and the few religious folk that looked for a Redeemer, were not likely to tell Herod's friends about things they might be sure they would feel no spiritual concern for. The only thing of much weight<sup>b</sup> against this opinion is, that it takes away a good argument for holy poverty. It used to be argued by devotional writers, that Mary and Joseph spent in charity all the Magi had given them, and were thus obliged to offer the offering of the poor. But if like St. Lawrence they preferred mercy to sacrifice on this theory, surely upon the other they may also supply an argument to shew, that when God's honour requires a journey, or other expense, he will provide the means. It shall be assumed then, without burdening a practical treatise like the present with chronological discussions, that the Purification took place before the arrival of the wise men. This assumption, which seems thoroughly well founded, will be found to throw great light upon the conduct of our Lady upon that occasion.

2. It may be asked, "what reason could there be for the purification at all? Mary, according to all

<sup>b</sup> The difficulty raised from Luke ii. 39. is so small, when compared with the difficulties of the other theory, as not to be worth considering at length. They might be said to return to Galilee, because they intended at the time to do so, and eventually did so after the flight into Egypt, which St. Luke omits.

that has been said, would have contracted no impurity, moral or physical, by bringing the Only-begotten into the world: why then subject herself to a law<sup>c</sup>, which was made not for the clean, but for the unclean? Is not this a proof, that there must be some flaw in your argument, be it where it may? Either you must make the Virgin to require purification; or, if she did not require it, you make her hypocritically go through a religious ceremony, which was a farce, if she did not want purification<sup>d</sup>."

3. Unfortunately, this argument, like so many others against equivocation in act or word, hits our Lord in plain English as hard as it does our Lady. In the same way you might say, Either our Lord required the baptism of repentance, which was all John had to give; or if he did not require it, it was a farce his being baptized at all. Nor can you urge that he had as the source of grace a power of hallowing creatures, and so of hallowing water for the washing away of sin: for this will not on your theory justify his hallowing it in a way calculated to make people think him a sinner, and in need of repentance. It may then fairly be said, if he who was

<sup>c</sup> Trombelli notices, vol. iii. p. 226. that the Law was only for the woman, *quæ suscepto semine* paruerit. The Hebrew rather means, *quæ semen dederit*, for which the phrase in the Vulgate is a free translation, and nothing more. Lev. xii. **כִּי תוֹרִיעַ** obviously might mean, who has supplied, what the woman supplies towards a child, which all modern scientific men consider to be the substance out of which the child is made. Kimchi (in v.) puts this passage, and **עֲשֵׂב מוֹרִיעַ וְרַע**,

from Gen. i. together.

<sup>d</sup> This style of argument might perhaps claim some antiquity for itself, if we had the whole of the argument in the words which follow: "I have shewn clearly," says Ammon of Adrianopolis, "the blasphemy into which the *Arians* fall, when they say, that Mary the Mother of God had need of the sacrifices offered, according to the Law, for women that have had a child." ap. Cyril. ad Regin. p. 50. See below, part iii. chap. 4.

God, for the sake of seeming like other men, was baptized with the baptism of repentance, then Mary, who was not God, nor holy, except by participation of God's holiness, might put on the appearance of one of the ordinary daughters of Eve. So again when Christ paid the tribute money, he knew perfectly well that he was Lord of the creation, although his doing so would make the receiving officers think him an ordinary man. Why might not Mary pay to God that which made no false impression on God or her own conscience, but solely on the receiving priest? There is nothing immoral in doing as other people do for the sake of seeming like them, whenever it is prudent to do so: and of course it never is prudent to do so, when they do what God forbids.

4. The question then resolves itself into this, what was it which made it prudent for Mary to appear like a sinner, and be numbered by men with the transgressors? To give the whole account of the matter may not be by any means easy, but one answer which is simple enough may be made: Herod was suspicious and cruel, and she was bound not to do any thing which might give him an occasion of falling. Exceptions attract notice, and get talked of: if the people in the neighbourhood got to know that Mary had not been purified, it might have been noticed, and have come to Herod's ears. Prudence then dictated the performance of all the ordinary rites, and the avoidance of every appearance of singularity. If, on the contrary, the purification had taken place after the arrival of the Magi, it would not have been prudent to appear in Jerusalem at all with the Child: if one of Herod's people had enquired whence they came, and had found this out, it would have been fatal to the

Child, unless by his divine providence he had prevented his own death in some special manner. As it was, there seems very good reason to think, that the apocryphal account of the murder of Zacharias is true, and that he was slain after all between the temple and the altar. It is an early tradition<sup>e</sup>, and though the reasons of it are differently given, it is the only account which will render our Lord's threat to the Jews intelligible. For there can be no doubt, that as our Lord begins with Abel<sup>f</sup> the first martyr, with whose murder the Jews had no direct concern, so he would end with the very last murder with which they had a direct concern. In the conflict of tradition with opinion we may set aside the latter: and if St. Jerome is only giving his opinion when he treats this as an apocryphal dream, he seems to be reckoning without his host. In his exemplary zeal against apocryphal books, he forgets what the plain and obvious sense of the Gospel requires, and transfers the murder spoken of to a period several centuries before Christ, and then *himself* quotes an apocryphal book to maintain his own view. Taking it for granted then that Zacharias did suffer, we have a Scripture proof of the need of prudence upon Mary's part, without going to the statesman-like selection of facts presented to us by the wily Josephus<sup>g</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> Tromb. iv. p. 86. and iii. p. 285.

<sup>f</sup> There is a tradition, that Adam was buried in Golgotha: so Abel's blood might cry from thence against the Jews, he probably being buried thereabouts also. Vide Bened. ad Append. August. Serm. 6. Ephrem, iii. p. 499. or O. T. p. 328.

<sup>g</sup> "Josephus being desirous to train up the heathen by probabilities to a good conceit of his nation, and those things which were written of them, hee must not laie too great a task upon their belief; and therefore still, when his history leads him to the mention of a strange thing, hee alwaies tempers the discourse with a con-



5. This being so, we may now proceed to consider the events that took place upon this occasion. Simeon was directed by the Holy Spirit to come into the temple, and when his parents brought in the Child Jesus to do for him according to the custom of the law, and were going to put him in the priest's hands for the purpose, Simeon "*also* took him into his arms, and blessed God, and said" the Nunc dimittis. It is pretty plain from this, that Simeon was not a priest himself, but probably belonged to some school of the prophets. The Nunc dimittis might not excite the attention of the priest, who very possibly hurried through his work, and went off as soon as his part of the business was over—or, if really a religious man, would be as little likely to tell Herod's party as Simeon himself. An irreligious man might have looked upon the whole party as a very shabby set out, and thought Simeon a pious old monk, who was gossiping in Scripture phrase about something or other. No doubt in both dispensations, abundance of priests might be found to deal with sacred things in this way. He thought, perhaps, he had left the old man to have his gossip out, with this shabby couple; if he chose to take an interest in them, well and good; let him have his

venient mixture of possibilities: and howsoever it sometimes endangers the main matter, yet we shall seldom find him reporting a wonder sincerely; but having warily taken off that which could seem incredible, he proposes the action under such easy circumstances as shall make it concord with human reason and common apprehension." John

Gregory, Tracts on the Septuagint, p. 42. For those who have no relish for this racy passage of a protestant writer, Baronius i. p. 93. may be cited, who says, *ex ipsiusmet scriptis . . . eum apertâ luce ostendimus mendacissimum*. Gesenius, if I remember right, in his *Geschichte der Heb. Spr.* makes his Hebrew scholarship *very* questionable.

fancies, poor old man! This is put so in order to shew, how possible it was for Simeon's prophecy to take no effect on the priest, even if he was a Herodian: he might have gone off, and not heard a syllable of it. St. Luke says not a word about the effect of the *Nunc dimittis* upon the priest; but observes, that his father and his mother were wondering (or kept wondering<sup>h</sup>, as the phrase would mean in Greek or Hebrew) at what was said about him. Even our Lord is said to wonder at unbelief, so that it would not imply necessarily that 'effect of novelty upon ignorance'<sup>i</sup> which wonder commonly implies. They might have wondered not at the things which were said, but at their being said at all; have wondered, i. e. at finding Simeon allowed to understand who the Child was, and to hint at his knowledge in terms intelligible enough to those already instructed in the Messiah's character and office, but easily mistakeable to the careless and irreligious. Yet the temple was a large place, and if it was before or after they accomplished all things according to the law, the priest might not have heard a syllable, either of the *Nunc dimittis*, or of the prophecy.

<sup>h</sup> So **הוּן עֲמִידִים**, Ps. cxii. 2. on which see Ewald. Heb. G. p. 537. §. 282. 2. and for the Greek, Kuhner, §. 416. 4. and Wunder. ad Soph. Philoct. 1191.

<sup>i</sup> Johnson's Life of Yalden, fin. Lugo, Disp. xxii. §. 5. no. 45. Licet nihil occurreret Christo vincens *omnem* ejus scientiam, potuit tamen aliquid occurrere vincens *aliquam* ejus scientiam, e. g. fides magna et inusitata centurionis; de quâ si judicium ferendum esset

juxta scientiam experimentalem, judicari potuisset hominem gentilem in belli tumultibus educatum tantam et talem fidem non habiturum, etc. Of course, if we admit an infused knowledge in the blessed Virgin, this distinction will apply in its measure to her also. And this I suppose to be the true way of accounting for her wonder, though it would have been anticipating the third part of this book to insist upon it in the text here.

6. Simeon next blesses them, and says to Mary his mother, not to every body, but to her, and probably in a low tone, "Behold, this Child is set for the ruin and resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against; and thine own soul shall a sword pass through, that the thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed." Things to come shortly to pass very likely coloured the words of this prophecy. The slaughter of the innocents, was an earnest of the ruin of many; the resurrection of many bodies of the saints, an earnest of a more general resurrection. Jesus would become a proverb and a by-word among the heathen, and so be a sign spoken against. But the next words are what more nearly concern us, because they more nearly concern Mary. Now I suppose no one will deny, that if it can be made clearly to appear how the piercing of Mary's soul contributes to the revealing of the thoughts of many, then the words are to be taken in the order in which they stand. There is another way of taking them, by which the words, 'Yea, and a sword shall pass through thine own soul,' are made a parenthesis, and the words, 'that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed,' are made to depend upon what preceded. The sense would then be: 'Christ shall be for the ruin and resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against, that it may be made manifest what is in man,' what the real character of many is. This to me is excessively objectionable, as it seems to go close upon the semi-pelagian principle, that men merit the gifts and calling of God by their inward character. For when the supposed parenthesis is omitted, the former part of the text will most naturally be taken of the *first* movement and impression which Christ makes upon



men, and the latter will imply that they must be in condition to receive grace in order to take that impression. If they have good hearts they will come to Christ, they will choose him rather than he them. Moreover, it wrests the words from the order in which they are, simply because it is not obvious at once how Mary's passion would operate upon men's hearts in the way spoken of.

7. But if we suppose Mary really to be the Mother of all living, then we shall see, that that passion which caused her to have adopted sons, has a great deal to do with revealing the thoughts of many hearts. At the time of the crucifixion, St. John was already chosen by Christ. Thoughts of faith, hope, and love towards Christ were in his heart, not because he had chosen Christ, but because Christ had chosen him. The existence of these divinely implanted thoughts were brought to light by Christ when he gave him Mary for his Mother, and that was, when a sword of grief was passing through her heart. He who had true love for Christ was tested then: Mary's passion was a suffering together with Christ, and he who could not feel for her, was not one of those to whom Christ had given love for himself. 'Every one that loveth her who begot, loveth him also who was born of her<sup>j</sup>.' The love of Mary is a proof therefore of the love of Christ. And the love of Mary includes a compassion for her bitter sorrows, which installed her in the dignity of the Mother of all living, a title St. Epiphanius and other Fathers have claimed for her. In venturing to offer this explanation of the passage, I am only acting consistently with a belief

I have expressed all along, and shall explain more fully by and by; that is, that Jesus is called her first-born Son, because all who are saved are made children of Mary, and brethren of Christ by adoption, and so, and in no other way, become inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. In saying this, of course I am not saying when or where or by what means God may put them under so great a Mother: but I do bless God for those whom he gives this love of her in this life. I think then, that the sword of grief which passed through her soul has a special tendency to reveal, whether or no God's grace has been working in men's hearts. This interpretation too is clear from all Pelagian leanings: it only asserts, that those whom God loves, love Mary, whereas the other comes near upon making the life men have been leading the ground of their call. We need only look at the Magdalen at the foot of the cross, to see how false this is.

8. In this way of explaining the prophecy, Simeon is made first to give a rapid glance at the whole of our Lord's life from beginning to end: the ruin he brought to the infants, and the resurrection of many in Israel, are but outward types of what would also go on invisibly in many more. The mention of the resurrection of many bodies of the saints which took place at the time of our Lord's death, brings that death to his mind, and the blasphemies of the Jews against him while he was dying. The thought of this naturally leads to that of the sword then piercing Mary's soul, and to the effects of those pains which she then felt, and which constituted her the Mother of all living a life of grace. These effects shewed themselves in drawing Christ's brethren to her, and thereby manifesting who were his. This inter-

pretation also accords with the language of the Church :

Quis est homo, qui non fleret  
Matrem Christi si videret  
In tanto supplicio ?

Hath he indeed a human heart,  
From whom the tear-drop would not start !  
Should he the Saviour's Mother see  
All writhing in her agony <sup>k</sup> !

Here the passion of our Lady is made the test of a good heart : the sword which passes through her reveals the thoughts of the heart, shews whether or no God has taken away our natural heart of stone and given us a heart of flesh. Upon the whole, this mode of interpretation seems sufficiently justified to enable us to proceed. Whoever looks into commentators on the text, will find sufficient variety to shew, that there is no one received interpretation, which it would be unsafe not to follow : whoever looks to the hymn of the Church just cited, will see how well it accords with that hymn : whoever considers the order of the words in Scripture, will see that it explains these without assuming an unnatural parenthesis. If it be worth adding, it is also consistent with the principles hitherto laid down in this work, not only with those just alluded to, but with what was said of St. Joseph's ignorance of Mary till God enlightened his soul. For this interpretation takes it for granted, that *we* can not feel for Mary till God gives us a heart of flesh. We may pray to

<sup>k</sup> That this is the real sense of *Quis est homo*, we learn from the authorized Italian version in the *Raccolta d Indulgenze*, p. 188.

Alla funerea scena  
Qui tiene il pianto a freno,  
Ha un cuore di tigre in seno,  
O cuore in sen non ha !

feel aright, when we remember that it is his gift : when we forget this, if neither sermons nor books on the subject lead us to feel aright, the fault may be with ourselves, and not with their bad reasoning or indistinctness. But a fault there is somewhere, as God took a Mother to help us through her to love him more, and not to keep us from him if we diligently seek him.

9. It has been said before, that Simeon's prophecy might have taken place while Joseph and Mary were on their way up the temple, and not yet in the priest's hearing. The same may be said of Anna's profession of faith<sup>1</sup> in our Lord, and speaking of him to all that looked for redemption in Israel. It is not likely, that people on the look out for a Redeemer would be able to talk very openly of their expectations. Herod might have made them pay dear for indulging openly in them. Hence it seems probable that Anna talked about the Lord privately to those about the temple then, and at other times, and did not preach upon the occasion, so as to excite suspicion. Like Holdah, she probably dwelt in a sort of school attached to the temple, and would have many opportunities there of seeing people quietly, and letting them know what was going on in the world of grace. But as the Gospel was preached to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile, it was necessary that our Lord should shew himself first to those in Israel who expected him, and then to the Magi afterwards. And it may be observed here, that the Catholic notion of a good woman is one which, though handed on from the Jewish Church, was yet sanctioned on this occasion by the countenance our Lord lent to it. Continuance

<sup>1</sup> ἀνθωμολογείτο τῷ Κυρίῳ.

in the temple, fasting and prayer day and night, these were the graces by which Anna was prepared to meet her Saviour. After seven years of married life, she had clung to the widow's state, and not waxed wanton against the coming Saviour. Thus there was married chastity in St. Joseph, virgin's in Mary, widow's in Anna, to greet the Infant Saviour. We have had also poverty in the offering they bring: chastity is before us: and now they have heard the prophecies, it seems from St. Luke, that they proceed, lastly, to the virtue of obedience to the law of the Lord, and to do all that is requisite with the priest.

10. After this, it seems that they started for Nazareth; and as their journey lay through Bethlehem, they may have stopped there upon their return, and were, we may suppose, very shortly after overtaken by the wise men who went to Jerusalem to make enquiries about the Child. This is the order of events observed in the ancient harmony of the Gospels, and the order which will secure to the Magi a period of forty days and upwards to make their journey. If we suppose some faint whispers about the Birth of the Child to have got abroad in Jerusalem, the occurrence of the fact now before us would of course rouse the suspicious monarch's rage. More need not be said here of this visit of the Magians, and of the gracious reception by the young Child's Mother in the house at Bethlehem. Materials have been furnished already to suggest to the reader reflections upon what then took place, so far as our Lady was concerned. But it will be more to our purpose to make some reflections upon the flight of the holy family into Egypt, and the hardships which the Sacred Infant then occasioned them. The first



circumstance which attracts our notice is the fact, that both in going and returning an angel of the Lord appears to Joseph and not to Mary, to inform him what to do. Doubtless Mary was already too well informed of the whole course of her Son's life, to need any further order from God what to do. Joseph, however, by being Mary's husband, had become the natural protector of the Infant and head of the household, and therefore it was in order to send the injunction to him. The superior knowledge of Mary exempted God her Son from any disrespect to her, in not sending his messenger to her, and furnished a scope for him to do homage to St. Joseph. He is addressed as if he bore rule in the family, and had the rights of a husband over Mary.

11. The journey at that time of the year could not have been else than toilsome and wearing: it probably exceeded two hundred miles. The presents of the Magians might have sufficed to maintain them upon their journey, and perhaps during their residence in Egypt. But the duration of this residence is very uncertain: some assign seven months for it, and some seven years: others other periods. The highest numbers probably in part originate from the assumption, that our Saviour was born four years later than he really was; the lowest computation seems to be favoured by St. Luke, who would hardly have spoken of our Lady returning to Galilee immediately after speaking of the Purification, if so long a period as seven years intervened. Hence the reflections found, in pious books sometimes, upon the Child Jesus wearily walking back with his parents, cannot be looked upon as of much value, and probably this is a modern view of the matter



altogether. There may be, however, evidence for it unknown to me. That the holy family were hospitably entertained for a night by a troop of robbers, who infested the borders of Egypt, and that one of their children (afterwards the penitent thief) was miraculously cured of leprosy on that occasion, is not improbable. For this was distinctly revealed to Sister Emerich<sup>m</sup>, a German nun, in the beginning of this century; and though sceptics may make light of such evidence altogether, no Christian can do so with any particular series of visions antecedently to examination. Sister Emerich's visions are too detailed and minute not to have betrayed their falsehood, if they were false: and too accurate and consonant with the conclusions of the learned, to have been the invention of a humble person as she was, or indeed the result of any thing but infused knowledge. They will, therefore, be occasionally referred to in this part of the work, as men of Gallio's turn of mind are not likely to trouble themselves with a work of this nature. It shall just be added, that the revelation of any amount of new facts concerning our Lord, would not constitute, in a technical sense, a new revelation; because the facts adducible in support of doctrine are in the revelation which was made originally to the Church. Any thing, whether deduced from acquired or infused science, may be used to throw light upon the teaching of the Church.

12. But it may be more in place to notice in this book things of more ancient date, because those for whom this work is written profess a reverence for what is ancient. The following words occur in Isaiah: "Behold, the Lord will ascend upon a swift

<sup>m</sup> Cap. xl.



cloud, and will enter into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst thereof<sup>n</sup>." Now it is certain, that many of the Fathers have understood the 'light cloud' here spoken of as a symbolic name for the blessed Virgin. Thus Ephrem on the place, referring evidently to a well-known opinion: "This is taken also of our Lord, who, when he appeared as man in the world, was carried, as if on a light cloud, upon the arms of the Virgin into Egypt." And on Jeremiah<sup>o</sup>: "The cloud on which the Lord rode, is a type of the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary." Now supposing a number of passages of this kind occurred, the meaning of the former part of the verse would shew how the latter part was to be understood; would shew, that the idols fell then and there, when and where our Lady took our blessed Saviour. This would be a fair inference, even if nothing of a more definite kind occurred, and there were no tradition asserting the fact which Isaias prophesied to have taken place. But the words of St. Ephrem, before those last quoted, will shew the existence of such a tradition. "He shall break the statues of the house of the sun, and shall burn the houses of the Egyptian gods with fire. This Bethshamesh is that which is called Heliopolis in Egypt; in which the worship of devils was exceedingly rife, and also that of helpless idols. And in it were huge statues, as high as a pomegranate. . . . Of these it is written, that the Lord broke them. However, it was not that he actually broke the idols and cast them down, but it was the worship of devils and idols, which the Lord Christ, when he appeared as man in the world, overthrew and destroyed and

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xix. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Chap. xlv.

confounded. And this is what Isaiah especially signifies, when he says, Behold, the Lord rides upon a light cloud, and enters Egypt, and shaken are the Egyptians' idols before him<sup>p</sup>." Now as this passage is not one commonly cited, it was worth giving it at length: it agrees however with the general tradition to that effect. Athanasius in his youth composed a treatise in defence of the Incarnation against the heathen, and after citing some passages from the prophets, and this among them, to observe upon, he says, "Which of the holy prophets or ancient patriarchs died upon the cross for the salvation of all? or who was wounded and taken away for the health of all? Which of the great or the kings came down to Egypt, so that by that descent Egypt's idols fell? Abraham went thither, but idolatry prevailed over all again: Moses was born there, yet for all that the religion of those in error kept there still." This great doctor plainly regards the proof of the fulfilment of the prophecy alluded to to be as clear as that of the others<sup>q</sup>. Eusebius, and Cyril of Jerusalem, mention a similar tradition<sup>r</sup>. The same seems to be alluded to by St. Austin<sup>s</sup>. But the Latin Fathers generally understand it of the destruction of idols, by the coming of Christ into the world, of

<sup>p</sup> Vol. ii. p. 145. The minute description of the idols here omitted, gives colour to a tradition that the saint had been in Egypt: which is worth noticing here, as he may have learnt this tradition from Athanasius possibly. I may observe, that Walton gives in the Syriac text, 'light clouds.' St. Ephrem has the singular in both places. Spohn Collat. p. 24. has not

noticed this; he quotes a similar passage from Severus of Antioch. I have rendered ; as if it was ; (a pomegranate) not knowing the other word.

<sup>q</sup> De Inc. §. 36.

<sup>r</sup> Ap. Tromb. iv. p. 21.

<sup>s</sup> De C. D. viii. 23. where Coquius also cites the passage just given, p. 803.

which Egypt is the type<sup>1</sup>. Yet this does not gainsay the belief in a more particular and immediate influence upon the idolatry of Egypt. Nor does it seem likely, that our Lord should have singled out that country without some special and immediate object, or that persons of such sanctity as our Lady and St. Joseph should have exercised no influence upon the people amongst whom they lived. Yet it is possible, that the place in which they sojourned may have been long after Christ's Ascension regarded by him with favourable eyes for his parents' sake, and that the wonderful doctors of the Trinity and Incarnation, Athanasius and Cyril, may have owed their lights and graces to her, who looked from heaven upon the country which had afforded a refuge in trouble, with eyes of affectionate recollection: for 'the whole race of saints is full of natural affection'<sup>2</sup>. And as it is commonly believed, that the saints of the desert owed their existence to this visit, why should not Egypt's doctors also be indebted to it? Nay, who can say that Mary's intercession in consequence of that visit did not obtain for St. Eulogius the inspiration to pray for the conversion of England<sup>3</sup>.

13. It may be useful to have suggested thoughts like these, even if they appear somewhat fanciful to some, because they tend to bring before the mind the influence Mary was gaining with Jesus day by

<sup>1</sup> A. Lapide gives several passages, all of which I have not access to. But no one should trust to A. Lapide's quotations, without examining whether the works referred to, are from genuine works of the authors referred to. In this case the passages adduced do not, though

genuine, seem to me to prove that Christ was believed by Jerome, Ambrose, &c. to have destroyed idolatry by going there.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. in Rom. p. 120. Savile.

<sup>3</sup> See above, part i. cap. xiii. init.

day. She had taken Divine Providence into Egypt : it was her own doing, though it was an inspired act. It is natural for mothers to feel an interest in a place where they have been sheltered with their infants in a time of danger, and to feel a sort of gratitude towards the very place. "Gratitude," says Cicero, "is not only by itself a very great virtue, but the mother of all the other virtues. What is filial affection, but a grateful mind towards our parents? Who are good citizens, who well deserving of their country at home and abroad, but they who are mindful of their country's benefits to them? Who are holy, who observant of religious duties, but they who pay gratitude to the immortal gods, with the due honours, and with mindful soul? What pleasure is there in life, if you take friendships out of it, and what friendship again amongst the ungrateful? Which is there of us that has had a liberal education, before whose mind those who educated him, his masters and his teachers, yea and the voiceless spot itself in which he was brought up or taught, do not come with a grateful recollection? In my opinion, nothing is so inherent in human nature, as to feel a tie not only in kindness, but even in the very intimation of it: nothing so inhuman, so barbarous, so ferocious, as to give ground for being looked upon, I will not say as unworthy of kindness, but as outdone in it<sup>y</sup>." Cicero was the writer who first led the impure unconverted Augustine<sup>z</sup> to reflect: is there not something here

<sup>y</sup> Cicero pro Planc. cap. 33.

<sup>z</sup> August. Confess. lib. iii.  
§. 7. Ille liber (Ciceronis Hortensius) *mutavit* affectum meum et ad te ipsum Domine *mutavit*

orationes meas, ac vota ac desideria mea *fecit alia*. This is the greatest honour Cicero ever earned. May Cardinal Mai discover this lost work!



which may lead Englishmen to reflect? Is there not much which grace could transplant, or graft upon the stock of religion? Is that feeling towards the voiceless spot itself one we should be willing to sever from a dying friend, if we thought he was leaving earth for heaven? And if so, why should we take it away from the soul of Joseph, Mary, or Jesus, who has still his human nature, and what is proper to it?



## CHAP. V.

THE DISCOVERY OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE, AFTER HE HAD BEEN LOST.

1. WE are capable of pain far more intense in kind and duration than any pleasure is, of which we are capable in this life. Yet the removal of pain is itself sometimes a great pleasure, in proportion to the intensity of that pain<sup>a</sup>. If therefore we wish to form some idea of the happiness of Mary, on which the last of the joyful mysteries dwells, we must first endeavour to form some idea of her pain at the loss of Jesus. In order to enter into this, it is necessary to observe, that the possession of any goods, internal or external, differs from the present enjoyment of them. Causes intervene to prevent this, when that continues. For instance, sleep is necessary under the common dispensation of Providence, and it suspends the present enjoyment of our moral or intellectual faculties and acquirements. Temporary insanity, though only casual under this dispensation, does the same. Many pleasures, either directly or indirectly, do the same. It does not follow then that a person has not the faculties, because under the ordinary dispensation of Providence, he may at any particular moment not have the present enjoyment of them. What is true of the ordinary, is true of the extraordinary, dispensations of Providence. For instance, Christ may have had the beatific vision

<sup>a</sup> Butler, Serm. vi. on Compass. p. 87.

all his life, even if it were a matter of certainty that it was suspended on the cross. Mary may have had habitually a full insight into all her Son's doings, even if for some purpose in view she had not on this occasion the present enjoyment of that insight. Now it shall be taken for granted here, that this was the case, that the clear insight she had into her Son's counsels habitually, was for a while suspended. This preternatural darkness, here assumed, will itself constitute a great part of her sorrow.

2. The grief of St. Joseph would be another great source of sorrow to her ; but before we consider this, let us endeavour to see if we can find out any reasons which (so to speak) will justify her Son for treating her in this manner. If he had made himself the Son of a human Mother, he was bound to honour not his Father only, but also his Mother. Something then ought to be said, to shew that the honouring of his Mother was incompatible with the honouring of his Father ; how the two were incompatible, seeing he lived so many years with Mary without acting again in the same way, is certainly any thing but obvious. We may of course take it upon faith that all he did was right, if that satisfies us, or if we cannot after all produce a sensible account of the matter. To do this, something should be said to shew that he only availed himself of his superior wisdom to shew his Mother what eventually was a greater mark of reverence to her. If this something can be produced, our object will be gained, which is to shew, that even upon the protestant theory, that our Lady was only a good woman, still the Catholic claims for her can be substantiated. Again, reminding my Catholic reader then to be patient of so absurd a supposition, I will

endeavour to construct a theory, which shall shew that our blessed Lord might have availed himself of his wisdom for the purpose just mentioned.

3. We have seen from the former part of this work, that there is every reason to think that our Lord subjected himself to that law of our nature by which we are creatures of habit. He learned obedience by what he suffered, and learned habits of compassion for our infirmities which he took to Heaven with him. But habits are formed by separate and repeated acts. If this was so then with Christ, much more was it so with Mary. She differed from Christ not only in not being God, but in this, that the infused grace and wisdom of her soul kept increasing, whereas in Christ they were perfect from the first. Hence there was in Mary a far ampler scope for habits than in Christ. He could have suffered all the tortures of his passion in as perfect a manner when a child as at thirty-three, and suffered them then as perfectly as he would have done at seventy. But as he had designed Mary to suffer in as nearly the same manner as was possible for a mere creature to do, it is not inconsistent to think, that he hardened and inured her for suffering by separate acts which formed a habit in her. Supposing she were a good woman only, plainly this is tenable, but surely there is nothing in it inconsistent even with the higher privileges we ascribe to her, and which are not to our purpose to insist on here. One of these separate acts is before us. To be deprived of the Lord God, and not to know why, was a vast furnace of affliction to a soul so ravished with love. To think, in her humility, that her want of care had caused Joseph such intense grief, would have heightened her sorrow.

For it seems that one so humble might have judged herself thus harshly, when we consider that, according to Venerable Bede<sup>b</sup>, it was usual on these occasions for the children to go sometimes with the men and sometimes with the women, who travelled separately. Another of these separate acts would be, when our Lord bid his Mother good bye, and exchanged the company of Mary at Nazareth for that of the devil in the wilderness, and was to see very little more of her till his Crucifixion. These would be separate acts, each going towards fitting his revered Mother for that intense passion she was to suffer at the foot of his cross. He may then have been in reality doing an act of respect to her, by preparing her for the great things he had designed for her.

4. Moreover, if he himself learnt in any sense by degrees, much more would Mary, and much more still others whom he had chosen out of the world to call to himself. Of course God could infuse habits at once, but in the ordinary course of things it is 'men who are for precipitating things, but the Author of nature appears deliberate throughout his operations; accomplishing his natural ends by slow successive steps<sup>c</sup>.' From this we might guess, even without proof, how he would act as the Author of grace also. Sudden conversions are rare, and when they seem sudden to the world, the convert often sees many and many a stealthy advance which grace had been making in his intellect and his conscience<sup>d</sup>, before it fairly entered in by storm, and

<sup>b</sup> In Luc. (p. 338. Giles,) quoted by Trombelli, vol. iv. p. 129.

<sup>d</sup> Comp. St. Austin's case, referred to at the end of the last chapter.

<sup>c</sup> Butler, Anal. ii. 4 fin.

bound the strong one. Now even if Mary had a deeper insight habitually into God's book of predestination than David his remote forefather, still a desolation and a darkening might have prevented her then reading the names there. The Son of God himself slept sometimes, and was unconscious of the outward world: why should not the eyes of Mary's soul be closed sometimes to the invisible world? Meantime our Saviour probably wished to make his first impression on Gamaliel or Nicodemus, or perhaps on St. Joseph of Arimathæa. He knew to a certainty how apt kind hearts are to say, before they do a person a harm, 'I knew him when he was a boy,' and this would hold them back from wrong; and he could make them kind. Had he put it before his Mother, to let him be crucified then in order that he might save them, she would have accepted it in her love for God and us. Still had he told her before, she could not have suffered them, as he designed her to do. The conversation of our Lord with Nicodemus makes such a supposition as this highly probable, as Nicodemus seems to have been touched by something, and to have that imperfect confidence which is displayed by his coming to Christ as if he knew him, but coming by night as if he feared men. Another confirmation shall be noticed presently, but there is one which may find a place here.

5. Archelaus does not seem to have been a very great contrast to his father, for we find that St. Joseph was afraid of him. It is therefore natural to ask, how Jesus comes to venture a display of any thing extraordinary among the doctors; and not unreasonable to suppose, that they were some of the same kind of persons, as those to whom he

\* See chap. vi. vii. viii.



was manifested in the temple at his first visit there? Nor is it again unnatural to suppose, that they were reasoning about the coming of the Messiah, and putting together such traditions and prophecies as would make its time and manner clear to them. There might have been some just object in facing even those who were to crucify him afterwards, but it is not very obvious, what that object could be. It is not God's manner to give clearer evidence to those who were abusing the 'light shining in a dark place,' already given them: it is his manner to give grace to the humble enquirer. This, as far as it goes, tends to shew what the character of the doctors then present was likely to be. Behold, (he says afterwards,) *I send you prophets and scribes*: some of the scribes might then be good men, and the converts were mostly from the pharisees, who held fast the traditions. This view of his audience, perhaps, is rendered more credible by the word St. Luke uses of our Lord. They were astonished at his intelligence and answers. Intelligence, says Aristotle, is 'a critical habit' of the soul about practical matters, which judges rightly when another speaks, and is often in popular language confused with prudence,' as St. Jerome has done here. Our Lord seems to have been 'swift to hear and slow to speak' then, if St. Luke meant to use the word *συνέσις* in this sense. If they put difficulties before him, of a mere wrangling nature, it does not appear what scope such a faculty would have for exercise: if they were really about an earnest enquiry, it would have abundant scope. There is something indecorous in supposing a modest

<sup>1</sup> Eth. N. vi. 10. The sentence of Aristotle is hard to render literally, but this is the drift of it. Cf. Wetsten. ad loc.



youth to have gone there to display his ingenuity in evading subtle and scholastic difficulties : something lovely in supposing that Christ went to suggest modes of explaining the numberless apparent inconsistencies in the prophets to men in anxious earnest. This at least shews it is possible he may have gone from his parents for a purpose he knew they would approve.

6. But if we suppose him not to have gone from them at all, and to have remained quietly with them, then we shall see still more clearly, how the course he really adopted led to a greater and more observable exhibition of reverence to his Mother. His Mother said to him, "Son, why hast thou done so to us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." These words in their plain and natural sense are a reproof to Jesus; and would be a gentle or severe one, according to the tone in which they are pronounced. There seems no reason why they should not be taken in this plain and natural sense, because our Lady really had authority over her Son, and had to keep the secret of his Incarnation close yet awhile. Hence she acted the part of a Mother as naturally as she could, not because she mistook Jesus's conduct for something wrong, but because she had to keep up the appearance of being a humble and ordinary person. Her conduct, though capable of being misinterpreted, yet expressed before all present a great truth : it was a public expression of her authority over Jesus. This view is confirmed by her calling St. Joseph his father : for this is another expression which was false in the sense in which the audience, she knew very well, would take it, yet it expressed his authority also over Jesus, and the relation he bore to herself. Hence

the Church uses this Gospel on the Feast of the Maternity of Mary; and hence St. Austin more than once observes, that our Lord made himself in his human nature a little lower \* not than Angels only, but also than Mary and Joseph, who were yet but travellers heavenward. She is inspired, as it were, to use words especially calculated to let all men see that she had authority over our Saviour, and therefore if Jesus purposely furnished her with this opportunity of displaying her authority, this seeming act of disrespect did but teach all generations why they were to call her blessed.

7. Of the reply of Jesus it is said, that Joseph and Mary themselves [αὐτοὶ] did not understand the words he used. It is very plain one should think from this, how 'absurd even to the degree of being ridiculous' it is, for those who never had any personal acquaintance with Jesus, to imagine they understand them to a certainty. Nothing it should seem could make it more clear, that there was something very profound in them. If then I bring myself to set down what I think would be the obvious meaning of the Greek words, let it not therefore be supposed that I imagine myself certain of the meaning: I do so, because the sense, which may be in them, will throw light upon what has been already remarked. St. Luke then had told us, that his parents had sought him amongst his relatives and acquaintance, [ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι]: and our Lord says, 'Why was it you sought me [where you did]? did you not know that I must needs be amongst my Father's relatives?' [ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Π. μου.] He seems in these words to allude to the custom of travelling, the men apart and the women apart, and bystanders might imagine

\* In Jo. xiv. 28. tr. lxxviii. §. 4. misquoted above, p. 204. n. q.

perhaps that he excused himself to his Mother, by saying he was with his Father's party. Meantime he meant something very different, and uses his Mother's word 'Father' with a play upon the word, such as abound in the Scriptures he had, as God, inspired. This would make him as it were assume, that the habitual state of his parents' mind was one of knowledge of the fact, that he must be among those who were of the Father and not of the world. The words, 'Did you not know,' seem to expect them to know, and intimate a desolation which destroyed their usual knowledge. Nor does it seem as if this meaning was at all excluded by the Vulgate. For to be amongst what belongs to my Father, or, in other words, to be about my Father's business, is to be about drawing souls to himself. If this then be the sense of the words, it would shew what sort of persons the doctors were, whom he honoured with his presence and his answers, and make it highly probable that Nicodemus and the rest were there. Moreover, this interpretation will furnish a ready solution to the difficulty found in his parents not understanding what he had said. For even supposing them to take them at once in the sense here suggested, still they might be said not to understand what he said, if at the time he had not revealed to them who they were, that he went to draw to himself. And this might be true even if it were not open to them to express wonder in reference to their acquired knowledge, as distinguished from any infused knowledge<sup>h</sup>. At all events, this interpretation shews the possibility of all that has been said of our Lady being true : it shews that objections drawn from the first appearances of Scripture may be by no means in-

<sup>h</sup> See above, chap. iv. §. 5.

surmountable. It is, however, merely an interpretation hazarded to shew, how even upon the absurd theory we are arguing upon, there is yet a meaning to be found for Scripture which will justify the reverence paid by Catholics to the Mother of God.

8. This opportunity then which our divine Saviour furnished to his blessed Mother for displaying her authority over him, was a great occasion of joy. Even a humble person is glad to have influence with the virtuous and rich, from the means of doing good it furnishes him. And Mary knew already from what she had done to the Baptist in the womb, that she would have power with Jesus. She knew that all generations would pronounce her blessed for the very same reason as Elizabeth did, viz. for her power over Jesus. This public display of her power was a fresh earnest to her of what her prophetic soul had foretold already. The joy of Joseph at finding Jesus increased her own joy : the joy she felt at calling him father of Jesus, gave her an earnest of his future power in the court of heaven ; the joy that she felt that this desolation which had befallen her, would be an encouragement to so many to persevere in the midst of desolation ; all these and many other joys contributed to place this among the joyful mysteries.

9. We are next informed, that our Saviour went down with them, and came to Nazareth, no doubt to the great joy of those kinsfolk and acquaintance who had heard that he had been missing. St. Luke adds, that he was subject to them, or, as the words would rather mean in Greek or Hebrew, and he kept subjecting himself to them, he kept on in a course of subjection<sup>1</sup>. This remark, which forms a sort of

<sup>1</sup> Vide n. h. p. 7.

reflection upon the history we have been considering, is worth making some additional comments upon. It shall, however, be just observed first, that what is said of his Mother keeping all these matters<sup>k</sup> in her heart, accords well with the interpretation here presented. For if Mary pondered over the whole affair in connection with Jesus's dutiful conduct, and kept both these in her heart, then we may suppose she took notice of the persons Jesus was found with, and what he had said, and his subsequent conduct, and saw perfectly well how his motives for leaving his parents were those of wishing to honour them publicly, and how the full meaning of his words could only be brought distinctly out by subsequent events. This will explain why St. Luke says, 'she kept these matters in her heart,' not before, but after he had said they were gone down to Nazareth. To this subjection then we shall now turn our attention, as it will enable us to see more distinctly the purport of the narrative we have been considering.

10. What we have been considering is this, what our Lord did in order to form in his Mother a habit of suffering, and how he created for her an opportunity for displaying her authority over him. These two points both lead us forward to further reflections, but as the former more naturally connects the joyous mysteries with the sorrowful, the reflections suggested by the latter shall be placed first. Having once seen how Jesus created for his Mother an opportunity of shewing her authority, we shall see that this must have been not an exception but a rule with him. For subjection implies a giving up of the will to

<sup>k</sup> כל הדברים האלה would mean not 'words' but 'matters:' the Greek and Latin may be barbarously literal versions of Hebrew.



another in all things not sinful. Now the will which Jesus gave up to his parents was his human will: his divine will was numerically the identical and self-same will as that of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. For a separate will implies a separate substance, and as there is but one substance in the three Persons, so there is but one will. This will is sovereign, and could not be subject to Mary: but Christ having taken the form or substance of a servile created nature, with this substance and with the will inherent in it, could serve Mary<sup>1</sup>. It is true that God was obedient to her by virtue of the oneness of Christ's Person, but not true that the Trinity obeyed her by virtue of the distinctness of Persons. This is what makes the Incarnation a mystery. This being so, it is plain how (the mystery being once received by faith) Jesus could obey Mary, to wit, with his human will. But the perfect union of the human and divine natures is such, that we conceive the human to have all communicable graces, and amongst them foresight. If then Jesus did any thing which he foresaw his parents would check him in, it may be asked, how could he be said to give up his will to them? how could he, who had willed beforehand to obey them, be said to give up the will he originally started with? In order to answer this, we must first of all suppose, that his rule was to create for them opportunities of exercising their authority over him. Certainly he foresaw they would do so, and inspired them with courage and grace to do so. Still it was open to him, because he was man, and had free will to choose

<sup>1</sup> "Under habits belonging to the mind, are comprehended general habits of life and conduct, such as those of obedience, and *submission* to authority or to any particular person." Butler, Anal. i. 5. p. 117.



one out of two good things, where perhaps the two were incompatible. Having chosen the state of obedience as the best, it was easy to create opportunities for his parents to exercise him therein. He could fix his will as long as he pleased on any one object, yet always hold it in readiness to relinquish that object when his parents bid him. Though he foresaw the exact moment when they would do so, still the fixing his will on that object till they did so, was making his will dependent upon theirs. If a few imaginary ones are set down, it will be only to help us to conceive the state of obedience in which he lived. He then who could teach the doctors, might very possibly have taught in his charity some children in the neighbourhood. (St. Ephrem even makes him play with his neighbour's children.) Now if St. Joseph had bid him to saw or plane, the duty of obedience would here be incompatible with the duty of instructing the ignorant. Or again, if he had chosen to kneel down and pray, and our Lady bade him go and sweep the cottage, his will to kneel must have given way to her will to have the house clean. It is easy indeed for scoffers to make sport of God's humble drudgery under his poor parents, but not easy to shew that the notion of subjection implies, if not just these very things, at all events, several things of this nature.

10. Or, the thing may be brought perhaps more graphically before us thus: if we could have a vision of the guardian Angels of the holy family in the house of Loretto, a deep impression (so to speak) would have been made in their memories, by what they had seen the Child Jesus do there. They, no doubt, could point out to us every little spot and place which was hallowed by those sufferings of his,

whereby he chose to learn obedience. In such and such a place Jesus was kneeling, when his Mother bade him come and take some nourishment : in such and such a place he transfigured himself in obedience to her, when he was worn down with the contemplation of his Passion : in such and such a place he left kneeling, to go and hold St. Joseph's work for him, or to heat his glue : in such and such a place he left off teaching a child, to assist his Mother in cooking their poor and scanty fare. The secrets of this house of Nazareth are too many and too great for us to understand, and if we could pour out the contents of these angelic memories before us, we should have our 'dispositions shaken beyond the reaches of our soul,' with the amazing eloquence of that divine humiliation, which, while it has persuaded Angels to become guardians of us filthy creatures, has not persuaded us to think it an evil to have our own will in every thing ! If Daniel and St. John, chaste as they were, fainted away at the sight of an Angel, self-will would require a special touch, communicating might, to enable it to linger for one hour in a vision of Nazareth. No man could see God so obedient, and live. Yet this went on for years and years after the death of Joseph, till Jesus was about thirty years old ; and it had gone on before, unless we suppose Jesus an undutiful child till he was twelve years old—unless we think that he who esteemed obedience so much, when he had, as the Jews reckon, come to years of discretion, lost all those earlier years of his life, which would naturally be spent in learning it.

11. We see, then, that it must have been the rule with Jesus to create for his parents opportunities of commanding him, and that his conduct in remaining with the doctors was only an instance of conformity

to that rule. What he may have done to increase in his Mother the habit of suffering, which many of the saints have thirstily coveted to gain, we do not know. That he gratified her thirst for suffering in some way, we may be sure. "Opportunities for suffering," said St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, "have been my desire from my youth, and my special request after holy communion. I esteem it as a great favour, and a divine grace. I know that the exercise of suffering is so precious and noble, that the Word in the bosom of the eternal Father, and abounding in the riches and delights of Paradise, inasmuch as he was without the state of suffering, came to earth in quest of this ornament, and he was God who could not be deceived<sup>m</sup>." Doubtless, then, means were given to our Lady for learning this habit as well as others in a preeminently perfect degree, such as made her merits capable of earning a crown of glory beyond all comparison the nearest to her Son's. It was needful for her to suffer, and so to be glorified with him. But this habit of suffering, learnt by degrees through actual experience, suggests to us to consider, what became of another habit which Mary had, the habit of commanding Jesus.

12. If a man had a dear friend, who had made him share all the secrets of his soul, so that he knew perfectly the innocence, integrity, and devotion to God, with which he had passed his life, he would

<sup>m</sup> Life, p. 364. This must not be so interpreted, as if the suffering was *the* final cause of the Incarnation, as the Eutychian party made it: (Causa incarnationis est crux. Maxentius, B. P. iv. part i. p. 437. e. and Apollin. ap. Leont. in Canis, i. p. 603. n. f. ibique Turrianum:) for the final cause was our salvation, as things are, upon any theory. Suffering was the means, not the end.

never suppose that all these had left him at death, but that they continued on after death to exercise themselves in whatever way they could find scope. If Jesus formed habits of compassion for us here on earth, but did not take those habits away with him to heaven, we have no hope in his intercession now : when our life has not been one of integrity, innocence, and devotion, we have no one to turn to whatever. Mary cannot move him, unless he retains his feelings of compassion. It is all over with us. But if we believe that three and thirty years' practice gave him these habits, with what shew of reason can we deny, that thirty years' practice gave him habits of obedience to Mary, which habits have ceased altogether to exist ? How can we make out that a distant relationship to us, possible only through the intervention of marvellous foreknowledge, enabled him to obtain in his life upon earth the most permanent habit of compassion for us ; but that the most intimate relationship to Mary, with continual opportunities for forming habits of obedience, led to no permanent habit of reverence for her wishes ? Let us have the thing fully and honestly before us, before we believe it : it comes to this ; The man Christ Jesus, being a real man, learnt habits of compassion for me some eighteen hundred years before I was born : those habits he learnt in thirty-three years, and they last to this day. But the man Christ Jesus, because he was a man, learnt habits of obedience to Mary for thirty years, when she was there present with him. These habits do not continue. If one of these conclusions is reasonable, the other is unreasonable : for both are drawn from the same major premiss, which is this : Habits formed during a long period of years continue after death :



we cannot make Jesus an exception to this rule, without destroying our hopes in him. Whatever therefore destroys our hopes in Mary, ought in reason to destroy our hopes in Jesus also.

13. But it will be said, this is reasoning from Butler's Analogy, and not from Scripture; or rather, reasoning from Plato<sup>a</sup>, and Aristotle, and Cicero, from whom Butler took his views of habits against Scripture. For Scripture represents the blessed Virgin on two occasions coming across our Saviour during his ministry, and as treated with coldness upon both. She appears to protestant eyes at least, to say nothing of Fathers, to interfere with the order of the miracle at Cana of Galilee, and at another time to want a private interview with him when he was engaged in his ministry. There are no symptoms of his habit of reverence for her then: this shews, that wherever the flaw may be, your argument is unsound somewhere. Principles which apply to other men cannot be made to apply to the Saviour, for, as far as we can see, he chose to suspend the action of these principles in this particular, and to exempt himself from any further allegiance to his Mother. And you yourself make out, that he could choose all that he underwent, or forego it, as he pleased; that he was not tied to any thing as matter of necessity, but on each separate occasion voluntarily conformed himself to the proportions of humanity. This is the objection.

14. Upon this objection it may be remarked, that if all it asserts were admitted to the full, it would leave the difficulty pretty much where it stands.

<sup>a</sup> Plato de Leg. i. 14. Arist. ap. August. de Trin. See E. N. lib. ii. Cicero Hortens. part i. cap. xv. §. 5. §. 14.

For a habit of reverence in our Lord's mind must be allowed to have existed for thirty years: but this implies the existence of a correlative habit in our Lady's mind, a habit of commanding. Will you exempt her too from the ordinary rules of mankind, and say that she also forfeited all the habit of influencing Jesus, which she had exercised for thirty years? Or if you do not like to concede to her this superhuman privilege, what will you say to account for Jesus's behaviour in letting her form such a habit, which he knew he could not snap and disappoint without giving her pain? Or if you shall excuse yourself, and say, that in the silence of Scripture, we may presume he stayed with her so long on purpose to break her of it by degrees, how will you make out then that Jesus behaved dutifully towards her? Why, when he was young, give her grace and wisdom and prudence to rule him; but take away these from his Mother as he was increasing in his display of them to others? You will be believing, at this rate the more unlikely, in order to destroy the credit of the more likely. Nor will you be able to account for the authority she tries to claim at Cana: you will make Jesus out to have been very unsuccessful in breaking her of the habit, if after all his pains she still clung to it so strongly as to need a public rebuff at a marriage feast. Or how will you clear him from deserving to be crucified, when in his own law he said, Let him that does not honour father or mother, die by death? The objection then, I repeat, if substantiated, will leave matters much where they were. Habits will be habits, even if Christ is not like other men.

15. But to make your objection (which I am



— aware you can cite Fathers in favour of°) good, you must suppose our Lord, not only determined to shake off Mary's yoke but, positively rude to her, in the case of the marriage feast. You must suppose he said the words in a tone which would not be justifiable even to a meddling woman any where, much less to such a Mother, in a tone wholly inconsistent with Christian meekness, let alone obedience and reverence. Let us see then in what sense a couple of learned Catholics have understood them: they are both pious writers, and though they differ in some respects, they agree in this, that no sense of the passage which makes our Lord disrespectful to his Mother can be the true sense. The name of the first of these writers is St. Cyril, and of the other, St. Augustine. "The Saviour (says the former, on the words, 'what is there to me and to thee?') shaped this expression excellently for us. For it was not fitting that he should come to action in a hurried way, or have the appearance of being

\* Newman on Athanas. c. Arian. p. 458. Trombelli, iv. p. 167. a. quote Athan. l. c. Irenæus, iii. 18. Nyssen in Verba. Pauli. 'Cum Christuserit subjectus, vol. ii. p. 9. b. Chrysostom of course, Hom. xx. in Jo. 2. Mont. vol. viii. p. 122. All these passages, except Chrysostom, depend for their protestantism, as the text, upon the tone in which they are read. It is ridiculous of course to judge of single statements apart from the whole tone of the author, and as ridiculous to make Irenæus hostile to Mary, as our Lord disobedient to parents. Trombelli has treated very little of the ob-

jections, and refers to Canisius de Beata, iv. 20. I am not enough acquainted with St. Chrysostom to be able to explain away what he says satisfactorily, but I never saw any passage quoted from any *genuine* work of his that I recollect, in favour of the Blessed Virgin. The literalist school were not likely to praise her, and, as far as I know them, never did. The allegorists, Ambrose, Augustine, Cyril, Ephrem, &c. &c. are the writers to praise Mary. I wish to draw attention to this fact; it is what I should have expected. See chap. xi.

a self-bidden wonder-worker, but it behoved him to come to it with difficulty, as to a favour rather for the need's sake, rather than for the spectators. And the obtaining of what people miss, appears more acceptable when it is not given to those who ask for it off-hand, but by the intervention of a slight delay, is forced on into the fairest of expectations. But especially by this does Christ shew, that the honour which is owed to parents is most worthy of account, undertaking as he did to do what he had no mind to do, out of reverence for his Mother. The woman then, having great influence towards the miracle getting done, prevailed, by persuading the Lord as her Son, through decorum<sup>p</sup>." And again, in speaking of the absurdity of supposing Divine Providence subjected to certain days and hours, he speaks as follows: "I will also add another thing which very nearly slipped my memory altogether, though it bears a great deal upon the subject in hand, or rather requires to be examined in the same fashion, though it is not hard to explain, but very easy *to him at least* who is at all intelligent, and has the senses of his mind practised for the distinguishing of good and evil. Well now, what is it about which we are speaking in these terms? The people of Cana were once keeping a marriage, and they lived near to Judea; it was in Galilee. Now they invited to the banquet the Lord with his Mother, and the holy disciples. A marriage was the reason of their feasting: but when our Lord, who ate with those collected there, was come to bless marriage which he had given the law of, wine failed them as they feasted. But the Mother, still using authority over her Son, owing to the<sup>a</sup> exceed-



ing submissiveness of our Saviour, and having also learnt from long experience his divine power and virtue, says, They have no wine: for she knew that he would accomplish, and that easily, what the nature of the circumstances required. But the Lord said to her, What is there to me and to thee, woman? My hour is not yet come." He then goes on to shew, how the miracle was done before the hour for doing it. But the passage given is enough to shew how the doctor of the Incarnation thought Jesus felt towards his Mother<sup>r</sup>. The doctor of grace, commenting on the passage, asks, "What is this? did he come to a marriage to teach that mothers are to be despised? Surely he, to whose marriage he came, married a wife to get children: and wished no doubt to be honoured by them when he had gotten them. Did he then come to a marriage to dishonour a Mother, when marriages are celebrated, and wives are taken in order to have children, whom God bids to honour their parents. Beyond a doubt, brethren, there is some hidden meaning here." "His Mother required a miracle: but he, *as it were*, did not recognise the human womb when he was going to do divine works, saying, as it were, that of me which does the miracle it is not you that begot, for you begot not my divinity; but because you begot my infirmity, then I shall recognise you, when infirmity itself shall hang on the cross. For this is what 'my hour is not yet come' means. Then he recognised her, who assuredly had always cognizance of her. And before

<sup>r</sup> P. 457-8. I have rendered the words *τὴν ἐν δυνάμει θεοπροπέει* by the Latin rather than the Greek. I suspect it should be

*τὴν ἐν ἀρετῇ θ. δύναμιν*. There is no other word but *ὑποταγήν*, to supply which would make too strong a statement.

he was born of her, he knew his Mother in predestination. And before God himself created her, out of whom himself was created as man, he knew his Mother, but till a certain hour in a mystical sense he does not recognise her\*."

16. If these expressions do not satisfy you that there is a sense in which wise and holy men have understood this passage, which supposes Christ to have honoured his Mother, even after his ministry had begun, more cannot be said. That *her* habit of expecting her influence to tell on Christ continued, the most adverse passages you can cite from Scripture or from Fathers will attest: and it lies with you to reconcile with the goodness and wisdom of Jesus the encouragement of such a habit, if he meant to thwart it. Or if Mary was so good as to have no habit she could not drop in an instant when she saw God objected to it, it lies with you to shew, how Christ came not to have succeeded better before in breaking her of this habit. With us, one or two seeming acts of irreverence would not tell against thirty years' reverence: they might remain difficulties, (though they do not in reality,) but we should at all events not allow that single acts unsaid a life, and a death too, which told for the contrary. And the same remarks nearly might be made upon the other passage which you have alleged, which of course will only prove that holiness was the cause of the maternal relationship, and not the reverse. Nor would it be unnatural to suppose, that his Mother had strictly ordered him to treat her with seeming disrespect in public, that while he was despised and rejected, she might be feasted with that humiliation which the saints have so often

\* In Jo. tr. viii. §. 5. §. 9. and cxix. §. 1.



coveted. This at least is less unnatural than the other hypothesis, which makes him act disrespectfully after years of respectfulness. Or again, if calls into the Church or into religious orders were to be part of the rule of his religion, as they undoubtedly are, Mary might with her Son have premeditated this method of bringing before his disciples that law, in as forcible a manner as possible. So that if such a dramatic way of bringing this before us is contrary to protestant views, it is not contrary to Catholic dogmas, which teach, that when calls of this kind are concerned, parents are to be made nothing of<sup>t</sup>.

17. Two reflections more shall be added here in the same order as before. The one is this; that supposing it true that our Lady was intended to have that prodigious influence which Catholics ascribe to her, you will then see why Christ lingered so long at Nazareth, thirsting as he was for our salvation, and able as he was to teach the most learned. That permanent and deep-seated habit of influencing him was not to be learnt in a day: he stayed with her till it was thoroughly and fully developed, firmly and unchangeably fixed in her, so that there was no possibility of effacing it. Nobody who believes Mary to be merely a good woman, can object to her requiring time to learn a habit: the immensity of her power will prevent even Catholics from objecting to her requiring time to learn authority over the human nature of the Word itself, not ashamed of obeying such a law. Nobody who believes her a good woman will believe, that sixteen or eighteen years after Christ's death could

<sup>t</sup> Ambr. in Luc. vi. §. 36. matrem suam non est Filio  
Præscripturus cæteris quoniam Dei dignus, sententiæ huic  
qui non reliquerit patrem et primus ipse se subjecit.

have effaced from her memory a habit relative to such a Person : Catholics, who believe the real presence of that Person in the Mass, will see how day by day she exercised some phase of that habit, and kept it alive. The other reflection is this, that if Mary's habits of authority or influence lasted after death, much more would they through the life of her Son. Consequently, whenever devotional writers assert that she exercised that power at the Crucifixion, such assertion gains strength from knowing that she had such a habit. We may take it for granted, that he who has put himself under an authority, will consult that authority upon all important occasions.



## CHAP. VI.

## THE AGONY OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR IN THE GARDEN.

IT is the doctrine of Catholic divines, that Almighty God alone is able to penetrate the substance of other beings, and thus to influence them by an access to their whole souls infinitely more intimate than that, which any created nature is capable of enjoying. But he does not avail himself of this sovereign power to compel by a tyrannical force those wills which he has created free, but to persuade them with what by a common figure may be called the irresistible eloquence of his Holy Spirit: he does not despotically destroy the freedom of a soul to make it do his will, but majestically wins it over to himself, as it were overpowering it with the sweet-smelling fragrance of that eternal substance which he applies to it according to his divine discretion. Controversies there are without end upon grace and free-will, but it is certain that no Catholic can deny the existence of free-will, or so state the doctrine of grace as to reduce free-will to a non-entity. This being so, it is plain, that if a person either put himself under obedience to a superior in whose holiness he had perfect confidence, or did so from confidence in the principle of obedience itself, he does not thereby cease to obey a man, and obey God who rules that man. The superior himself has a will, which, though ruled by God, is yet his own will, and the subject is subject to that will. It is true to say, that the subject obeys the will of that

superior. Nevertheless, it might be possible that we should have to judge, whether a person did wisely in making himself the subject of such and such a superior: we might have to consider, not whether or no he had carried out the will of the superior, but whether the original act by which he put himself under that will was a wise one. In judging whether he had obeyed or no, we should consider his former habits of obedience, and what the superior's will either decidedly was, or probably was: and then we should decide upon the likelihood of his having obeyed, and speak of the superior's will, and not of his holiness, of what he had ordered, and not of what God had done for him. In judging of the wisdom of choosing such a superior, it would be proper to consider God's part of the matter rather, how far his soul was in a habitual state of grace, how far it was subdued to harmony with God's will. The character which the subject also had displayed for tact and discretion beforehand, might materially influence our judgment upon the goodness of his choice.

2. Now it is a very common thing for Catholic preachers to represent our Lord as going to ask Mary's leave to be crucified, and this often shocks a neophyte, as if it were absurd to make the salvation of mankind depend upon the will of a woman. This is not indeed a doctrine of the Church, but a sufficiently common opinion to claim some notice here. It is just conceivable, that a good Catholic should not hold this pious opinion when propounded to him: and certain, that no one would be excluded from the Church, because he was not prepared to receive it, before his admittance to her lights and graces. Still it is an opinion so naturally resulting

from the whole tenor of this book, and so inevitable a consequence from the theory of habits here applied even to Jesus and Mary, that it would be in every way undesirable to avoid the discussion of it. It is absurd for us who have supposed the influence of these habits to last on in some shape even into a future state, to deny their agency here.

3. The discretion of our Lord in choosing the superior he did choose, scarcely any one but an infidel will question. Neither does it seem that any one could reasonably be condemned for putting himself under an authority pronounced by an Angel to be full of grace, or highly favoured, if you please. Nor would it be surprising that Christ knew of what had happened before his birth, even if we forgot his divinity, seeing he knew what Satan's thoughts were, and might therefore be presumed to know the contents of an Angel's memory: seeing also he knew what future things the Angels did not know, and therefore would not be ignorant of the past. If then we supposed that one of the first acts of his human will upon its creation was to choose Mary for his superior, it would not be indiscreet in him to do so. Honour thy Father and thy Mother is the first commandment with promise, and he who had come in the flesh to obtain what as God he had promised, could not discreetly omit the means of obtaining that promise. His privations at Nazareth were the school of suffering in which he learnt obedience. When he entered into his rest and the true land of promise, he carried with him not only his compassion for us, but the fruits of that protracted obedience to his Mother. If we were even to deny the wisdom of his choice of her for a superior, still if it were made a question whether in the particular instance

before us he obeyed her, the probability or improbability of that fact could be settled by his former habits. 'Fit credibiliorum fides,' says St. Austin, 'ex incredibilioribus creditis.' Things more credible gain confirmation from things less credible already believed. If we believe that Almighty God filled a human soul with grace and truth by creating it in perfect union with himself, and also believe that this soul for thirty years subjected itself to a mere good woman, then there is nothing hard to believe in the supposition, that before the most solemn act of his life he consulted the authority he had gone by all along. If we believe moreover that this same person was very God, and that it was he who by his equality to the Father gave his Mother the authority she enjoyed, and that the gifts and calling of God are without repentance upon his part, then we shall be very slow in admitting, that on this solemn occasion he did not consult his Mother. Why should he who could inspire her will without destroying it, be thought foolish for obeying it? Why should he who had taken the form of a slave, just pretermit obedience when he was going to die like a slave? Why, when he had obeyed all along, not be obedient even to the death of the Cross? If you say he obeyed his Father's, that is, his own, divine will, how do you make him a slave? A slave is a person who has some human being for a master or mistress. The nature of a slave which he took seems to require such a mistress.

4. Of course it is easy to foresee, that the answer made to this will be drawn from certain passages in which our Lord seems to have emancipated himself from his Mother's yoke upon the commencement of his ministry: these passages have been

already considered in the last chapter exegetically ; but here they shall be considered morally, that is to say, a few remarks shall be made upon the temper of mind from which they seem to proceed. In the first place it should be remembered, that those who read the Scripture with a strong prepossession against the state of obedience, see the passages just alluded to through a coloured medium : they fancy they take an impression from *them*, while it is their own prepossessions which have really created in them that impression. This may be illustrated by another text : If thou mayest be free, says St. Paul, *use it* rather <sup>a</sup>. The ancients, who lived among circumstances in which slavery was a normal state, understand by this, if you may be free, prefer slavery : follow Christ, who put on a slavish nature, and paid tribute as though not master of the world ; you are not God, and may well be content to remain in a state far less unbecoming to a creature's dignity, than was Christ's to a Creator's. Something of this sort was the received interpretation, in former times, of the Church. In modern times, when slavery is gone and freedom thought a fine thing, the words 'use it rather' are often taken to mean 'prefer liberty' <sup>b</sup>. This is merely a specimen in a cognate matter to

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 21.

<sup>b</sup> A. Lapide in loc. prefers liberty, but quotes Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and St. Thomas, as preferring slavery. But the finest specimen of the modern tendency may be seen in Schaaf's Syriac Test. where *ܐܠܝܢܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ* is rendered, *elige tibi potius quam* (sic) *ut servias*. Choose for thyself to serve, is thus

turned into, Choose for thyself *it rather than* to serve, as if it were *ܐܠܝܢܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ*. How the Greek could be wrested to the modern interpretation, heaven knows : *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασαι*, is plainly, 'but even if you can,' &c. as the Greek Fathers took it. St. Paul too is urging men to continue free *or* slaves, as they were called.



shew, how with different prepossessions the same text may be wrested to opposite meanings. This text even Catholic interpreters explain to favour liberty. But if you come to less severe exactions of obedience, you will find protestants opposed to them also: thus the religious state of obedience is no friend of theirs, it is not even an acquaintance in many instances. Moreover, the obligation of children to obey their parents is much more strictly laid down by Catholic divines than by protestants, and is made to last through life. Hence the prejudices of the two run in counter directions, and the texts of Scripture, which the protestant would even wrest to favour liberty, seem to the protestant to be wrested by the Catholic, when he makes them favour obedience. The latter is unwilling to think so perfect an example would do any thing to emancipate himself from a state, which it is his own bounden duty to speak of with respect: the former is unwilling to hear any thing in favour of an interpretation which will support a doctrine which he hates, and which, if true, condemns him and his protestantism root and branch. Very few men judge by evidence only, and very many by antecedent probabilities, or what appear with their own prepossessions to be such. This being so with regard to Scripture, must likewise be so with regard to deductions made from it. To a monk under vows of obedience, the probability that Christ asked his Mother's leave before he went to suffer will be very great: to a protestant it will be very small. A fair minded person will make allowance for the prepossessions of the two, and will acknowledge, that before you can settle which of the two is in the right upon this question in particular, you must



settle which of the two has the firmest grasp upon the religion of him who took upon him the form of a servant. Till that is settled, it will not be fair to condemn a pious opinion, merely because to people with certain prepossessions it appears impious.

5. It is possible also that it may be objected, that when Christ is spoken of as learning obedience by the things he suffered at Nazareth, you are adding to Scripture, which makes that statement about his Passion apparently, and not about his early years. Now I will candidly confess, that though the passage appears to me to imply a whole course of conduct, and not the single event of his Passion, yet that the generality of our divines understand it of his Passion chiefly<sup>c</sup>. However, without discussing so important a text here, the use they make of this text is substantially the same as that here made of it. For they use it to shew, that Christ was capable of learning obedience experimentally, that is to say, of gaining habits from actions several times repeated. But the action of giving his will up to Mary's was several times repeated, repeated far more often than, during the comparatively short period of his Passion, the action of submitting his human to his divine will was. Consequently, it is

<sup>c</sup> A. Lapidè in loc. p. 871. 'Non quasi in passione demum didicerit obedientiæ virtutem aut acquisierit quam ante ignorabat; illam enim optime cognoscebat et callebat, tum per scientiam infusam in primo conceptionis suæ instanti, tum per experientiam triginta quatuor annorum et totius vitæ suæ: sed quia obedientiam hanc novo et exactiore modo expertus est in passione, &c.'

Lugo inclines to taking the passage with St. Chrysostome and Justiniani (in loc. p. 679. 2. A.) of the sacerdotal prayer made on the Cross, and not of the private prayer made in the garden. Disp. xxix. §. 2. fin. To me the words 'in the days of his flesh &c.' (though αν ἀπαξ λεγόμενον) and ἀφ' ὧν and τελειωθείς, all seem to imply a whole course of action.

not improper to apply the language of this passage, even if it is directly used of his Passion only, to his privations and submissiveness at Nazareth. For the text implies, that he was able to gain habits by acting often in one way.

6. Let us retire then again to Nazareth, and see what bearing his submission there has had upon his Passion, which we are now proceeding to consider. It will be found, that even if we think it ever so improbable that he did not go to suffer without begging his Mother's permission, still his sojourn at Nazareth bears most importantly upon his Mother's relation to his Passion. For, in the first place, her meditative mind could not have withheld itself from reflecting before his birth upon those manifold types and prophecies, which foreshadowed the great Sacrifice upon Calvary. Her yearly visits to Jerusalem after his birth, would have made her gaze with profound contemplation upon the paschal lamb offered there, and long for a minute explanation of the attendant ceremonies. Thus much must be conceded to a good woman, who meditated day and night upon the law. If we put out of sight all supernatural channels of communication, and all interior illuminations granted to her by her all-wise Child, still she had such abundant opportunities of questioning him by word of mouth, and ordering him to describe the details of his Passion, as no other person ever had. When all the Angels of God were worshipping him in that cottage, they might have listened with awe to the declarations the Child made to his Mother, and expected with eagerness her command to him to proceed in filling up the sketch of his Agony and Passion.

7. An imaginary instance will serve, as before, to

bring this more strongly before us, and therefore such a one shall be hazarded here. Suppose then that the holy family had returned after the event described in the last chapter, and that Mary, (supposed to be only a good woman,) finding herself alone with Jesus, called him to her, and said, ‘My dear Child, tell me now what induced you to behave in the way you did to Joseph and myself. I never knew you treat us so disrespectfully before.’ This would not (upon the supposition we are reasoning upon) be an unnatural remark to make. It would not perhaps be wrong to suppose, that a reply of the following kind might be made to the question if put: ‘A time is coming, when I shall have to separate myself from you by an agonizing death: it was necessary for me to prepare you by experience for the loss I know you will feel so keenly. Hence in these three days I have given you a foretaste of that suffering.’ Such a reply, which might have been conveyed by inspiration without any sound of words, would lead Mary to enquire what sort of death it was he was to suffer. When informed of this, a kind Mother’s anxiety would prompt her to ask next, about the preludes to this death. He would then communicate to her the nature of that Agony which he was to undergo, after his amazing charity to the traitor Judas, and describe all his interior sufferings in the Garden, the way in which they worked upon his mind, and through his mind upon his body; that pain, and utter astonishment, and faintness, which it seems, from the words used by the Evangelists, came over him. Moreover, as kindred spirits understand each other easily, and a look will do more to inform a friend of what goes on within, than many words a stranger, Jesus

by his whole self could speak to Mary things unutterable to others, and declare to her what ends he had precisely in view in this lavish expenditure of suffering; he could give her strength to bear up against the sickening sight of an ever multiplying progression of sin, and dare to set before her prophetic gaze the boundless ocean of human guilt which would then inundate his own soul. As he by his touch enabled the innocent St. John to bear his glorified presence undismayed, so he could infuse into Mary courage to face the vision of his prodigious degradation and misery, while himself recounted it step by step beforehand, and put her in possession of his secret future history, as if by a sort of confession, disburdening his soul at her command of all its sorrows.

8. All along it has been supposed, that a good woman might feel a holy curiosity about things going on in her presence: it is impossible but that she should have felt (putting supernatural gifts aside) a Mother's curiosity about what was to go on in her absence. If Jesus really was subject to her, he could not but obediently answer all her questions, and put her in full possession of the details of his Agony and Passion. Each conversation upon the subject would have led to fresh meditation upon what was told her, and each meditation to fresh questions. There is scarcely a passage in the Gospels upon which, if we meditate, we shall not find some detail upon which we should like to question Jesus, if he condescended to listen to our questions: much more would Mary find endless points upon which to question her obedient God. The sun stood still for Josue, but God for Mary. God hearkened to the voice of Mary as she questioned him, and



went not away to his work till she had done. As however even a Mother's love, if unassisted by divine graces, might forget some details, she could also bid her Son give her the grace which teaches all things and brings all things to mind, both to enlighten her in questioning, and to make her retentive of what was told. The more we turn the thing over in our minds, the more we shall see, that if we once admit Mary to be the Mother of God and a good woman, then we cannot stop short of supposing her to be perfectly and retentively aware of all that went on during the Agony in the garden. It is true that Eliseus the prophet knew all that went on in the king of Syria's privy chamber ; it is true that many things have been shewn to the saints in visions, and that God has many and preternatural ways of informing those he loves of what is going on : yet we need not suppose this, in order to see how Mary's eyes were fixed on Jesus, as the flesh she had given him streamed with blood in the garden, or at the pillar, or at the crowning with thorns. She might have learnt the lesson of the Passion by heart, and have known every syllable of it by repeated questionings about it : and it was enough at the time to have a common mother's heart, to make her feel it as acutely as if she saw her Son with her own eyes undergoing it. It is not much to require of our adversaries, that they should believe that the Mother of God had a woman's curiosity about her Child, and a woman's love for him when he was suffering. If they will only grant this, and think with a natural heart over it till the tears flow and the hard gaze of the intellect is dim, they will come to the Church's faith more swiftly than they anticipate. We mean

time are patiently stripping Mary herself of all her glories, to see what will follow from earnestly believing she was only a good woman.

9. In that awful hour, when the Son of Man fell upon his face to pray his chalice might pass from him, among other sins which were before him, were all manner of blasphemies wherewith men should blaspheme him: he saw the beast open his mouth to blaspheme not only God's name, but Mary, the tabernacle he had dwelt so long in, and those that dwell in heaven. He saw the opiated doctor of heresy open his mouth to judge contemptuously saints that dwell in heaven, for lauding and magnifying that Tabernacle. It was part of his bitter chalice to see that magnificent creation of the Holy Ghost, his Mother Mary, whom he had created to draw sinners to himself by her, shunned, disliked, and abused by men who pretended to believe, that God of God and Light of Light was born of her. He saw men shrink as if in horror from the greatest exertion of his creative love, from Mary whom he had created to shield the guilty from that vengeance he had claimed to be his own, and denied to creatures. God himself, if he were not prescient of all things, might have fallen upon his face in blank disappointment, when he saw thousands of professing Christians casting his chief work of love behind them, and putting it out of sight as if a corpse, to which fear and hatred should be mutes! He knew all Mary's love for poor human nature the while, and knew that she knew how his chief works of love would fare with many. Three times he fell upon his face, as if to master by degrees the unnatural ingratitude of man! Somewhat amazed him in his



Agony : perchance to see the unnatural rejection of such a Mother was that which amazed him, was at least one of the things that amazed him !

10. If we look back awhile to his own preaching and miracles, we shall find how, in the full perfection of his humanity, his heart was at Nazareth all the while. When he opened his mouth to teach, it was with that word which all generations were to use of Mary, 'Blessed.' Blessed are the poor in spirit, he said, and she doubtless was before him who was to be queen in the kingdom of heaven, and through her meekness to possess the earth. Blessed are they that mourn, and he had left one behind him mourning for that loss of him which she had heard of at the Purification, felt at the twelfth Passover, and knew would soon happen again, till she should be comforted by the beloved disciple. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, and she was left behind whose soul continually strove to share the feast of suffering which was to her Son that meat which men knew not, and to drink that chalice his martyrs were to share, and among them John, who, like herself, had a martyr's heart of love without the gratification of dying of that love ! Blessed are the merciful ; and she was in his mind, whose mercy he had seen so many proofs of at Nazareth. Blessed are the clean of heart, are words he could not say without a thought on Mary, who perhaps, even in the flesh, enjoyed the beatific vision at times. Blessed are the peacemakers ; but Mary had made Jesus, who is our peace, so far as a creature can make any thing, and was to make peace with God for us by her prayers. Blessed too was she who for Christ our justice's sake had left house and home, had been slandered by men, and was soon to be tormented at heart by his Passion.

Blessed, lastly, was she against whom all manner of evil has been said for Christ's sake, for that foolishness of God, which was specially displayed in his becoming the obedient Child of a woman.

11. In many parts of his preaching he can hardly fail to have had before his mind that bright mirror of heavenly wisdom, in which he had seen the exactest copy of himself that ever was to be produced by his wonder-working grace. For how could he speak of the widow's corban, and not bethink himself of the offering Mary had made in the temple when she presented to God himself, who was her all! Or when he preached the duty of abandoning father and mother for the Gospel's sake, could he fail to remember, (if the expression may be forgiven,) how he had preached this duty in leaving heaven first, and then Nazareth also! When he praised poverty, chastity, or obedience, would not his heart go naturally back to Mary's cottage? When he spoke of a lily being arrayed in greater glory than Solomon, and foreknew on whom his Church would bestow the title of 'Lily of purity,' he could not but bethink himself of those inward lights and graces with which he had made his Mother not outwardly, but inwardly, greater than Solomon. When he spoke of the anguish of a woman in childbirth, his soul must have throbbed for those sorrows he knew Mary would feel when he would make her the Mother of all living at the foot of the Cross. So too when he compares the kingdom of heaven to leaven which a *woman took* and hid in three measures of meal, his Mother must have been in his mind.

12. What may be said of his teaching, may be said of many of his miracles. Perhaps, if we could see it, we should find that he, who knew what was in man, knew the prayers in Mary's heart, and did every

single one of them at her special bidding and intercession. It is highly probable, that he who did nothing without revealing it to his servants the prophets, should have done nothing without revealing it to his superior, Mary. But be this as it may, there are some miracles, which almost force us to think that Jesus looked back to Mary when he did them. Mary probably was a widow much before this time, and knew she was to lose her Son : now when Jesus raised the son of the widow of Nain, he could hardly help thinking of his poor Mother ; the thought of her sufferings at the crucifixion, might perhaps have been what worked upon his tender heart at the time, and induced him to pity the poor widow's desolation, and to raise her son. Jesus had all the blameless feelings of our nature, and there is nothing wrong in supposing his mercy came round to the widow by this route. Or again, when by multiplying bread he filled the hungry with good things, he could hardly help thinking of Mary's beautiful Magnificat pronounced at a time, when through her means he did his first invisible miracle to St. John the Baptist. Or, to instance in another invisible miracle of grace, how could he convert the Magdalene, without bethinking himself of that Virgin, for whose company at the foot of the Cross he had fitted this poor harlot ? But these specimens will be enough to suggest to the meditative to look for thoughts of home in all the affectionate Son of Mary did or said, and surely they at least will find them. The more they meditate on the Gospel, the oftener Mary will rise before them. It is indeed a purely human way of speaking of our Saviour to represent these things as if they occurred one by one to his memory, and as if his divine vision of all actual things, past present and to come, were

ignored. Yet it may serve as a rough yet forcible way of bringing before our tardy-gaited imaginations the thought, that Jesus had Mary always before his mind, as the most beautiful and finished work of his new creation. The thought of her, if we may so put it, was familiar to him ; all he had said to her and done for her would come naturally before him. There was nothing in the supernatural dignity of his human nature to hinder, but much to help this natural tendency to bear in mind his Mother. Hence, when he fell down with his face upon the earth, not only all the impurities and iniquities with which Catholics would offend her were before him, but the cold-hearted unnatural aversion, with which many would regard the greatest creation of his mercy, chilled, as it were, his divine heart. He had wished them to be his brothers : but they (he foresaw) had no mind to be children of his Mother. His own plan for saving them, they counted to be foolishness.

13. In this way we may see how, if we try to look at the Passion of our Lord through the medium of Mary, we may penetrate into some of the recesses of it which we should otherwise have passed by. Such a mode of treating the events of his Passion is natural enough to a Catholic, but may easily be regarded by the protestant as unscriptural and unjustifiable. In a work like the present, therefore, it would be undesirable to do more than exhibit specimens of it. They are enough to shew the free and unrestrained way in which we are allowed to meditate upon holy writ : and enough also, if here and there they meet with a natural heart, to reveal the thoughts of it, and to draw it in the right direction. The seventh and eighth mysteries of the Rosary, which treat of our Lord's scourging at the pillar, and his coronation



with thorns might easily be dwelt upon in a similar manner. His Mother's knowledge also of the value of his precious Blood might be insisted upon in all these three mysteries, as being that which enhanced in her sight the profuseness of her Son's love to us. She knew that it was hypostatically united to his divine nature, and therefore felt intensely the guilt of those who were spilling it so recklessly, and of those whose sins are said to spill it afresh. When therefore we endeavour to gaze upon all these mysteries with Mary's eyes, we shall take this knowledge of hers into consideration, and be able to behold our Saviour in the midst of his sufferings with more lively sorrow. But however much food for devout contemplation upon the Passion this may afford, it would tend little to the object of this book to pursue these reflections to a greater length, and therefore nothing more will be said here upon these subjects.

14. There is one other point to which, before we come to the consideration of the Crucifixion itself, attention ought to be drawn here. It is now universally believed, that his blessed Mother met our Lord as he went to Calvary. Of this the Evangelists say nothing directly; all we learn is, that women followed him<sup>d</sup>, and that Mary was at the foot of the cross; which two things make this probable in the very highest degree. Notwithstanding all that has been said upon the knowledge of the Passion, in all its minutest details, which our blessed Lady could easily have obtained by natural means from the mouth of our Lord, it may yet be perfectly true, that experimental knowledge differs from recollection. Even if we suppose our Lady to be something more than a good woman, and

<sup>d</sup> Luke xxiii. 27.



suppose her capable of reaching by visions and other supernatural means at the knowledge of what was going on, still this does not preclude the use of natural means, and the desire of using these, by hearing, seeing, and the like. Supernatural gifts do not destroy natural ones. Our Lord himself was limited by time and space in the use of his senses, because he subjected himself to such limitations. He could not see his Mother's face when she was a mile off from him any more than we can, and may be supposed capable of having certain feelings stirred at the sight or touch of her, or at the sound of her voice. And Mary in like manner may, in spite of knowledge gained from memory or other sources, have been desirous also to hear from the disciples about her Son, or to see him, and to have felt certain emotions at the sight. In the Gospel we are told, when Jesus looked upon a certain young man, he loved him, although he knew from the beginning who were his. So too of Mary it might be said, when she looked upon her Son she pitied him, although she knew by other means—nay even if she had means as like, as was possible for a creature, to those which her Son and Creator had—of knowing what was doing throughout the whole of his sufferings. There is nothing then incoherent with what has been already said, in supposing that Mary tried to see her Son torn with thorns, soaked in blood, covered with spittle, vested in ragged purple, and bowed down with the weight of a cross. She wished for, and obtained, an external representation of what her memory, or her infused graces, represented to her internally.

15. Much light is thrown upon this, by considering one of the details of our Lord's Agony: an angel is

said to appear to him, strengthening him. Now angels cannot penetrate the substance of our souls as God can, and yet they may have some mode of placing things before our imagination, and affecting us by means of these representations. It is quite clear that bad angels have power to molest us against our will with evil representations: the greatest saints have been harassed in this way; and no doubt our Lord himself was so harassed, though not against his will, for our encouragement, not only in the wilderness, but in the garden. In each case he accepted the ministration of those angels who guarded him, lest he should dash his foot against a stone. If then our Lord lowered himself so far as voluntarily to need interior representations of this nature, it is no degradation to our Lady to say, she chose to see with her eyes her Son in the midst of his suffering. The imagination works most easily when the senses have stocked it with images first: but perhaps it may be true to say, that it works most easily of all when the senses work with it. If I read something aloud, I must see it first, and then remember what the letters stand for, and then remember the whole word, and then remember what organs I must use to make a sound corresponding to it. As here I remember unconsciously, and do not call it remembering, because the senses are at work at the same time: so it may be said, that I imagine even when the senses are at work. The blessed Virgin's imagination (if she were but a good woman) may have been then most strongly worked upon by the sight of her Son in this plight. The senses would help her to represent to herself, through imagination, all that he had told her of those interior sufferings, which accompanies these exterior ones.

At a time when her Son had so abandoned himself to agony, as to need the strength which creatures could supply by intimate representations, it is no disparagement to Mary to say, that she needed the actual sight of Jesus in order to have a vivid conception of the magnificent humiliation which was then going on in him. Nor is it at all improbable that she ordered him, in right of her maternal authority, to withdraw from herself every degree of supernatural grace which could be withdrawn without harm to her holiness. The desire to suffer for Christ has been so strong in common saints, that Catholics will readily allow in Mary the desire of being as like as possible in every particular to Jesus.

16. This leads us to observe, that the revealed account of our Lord's sufferings must be made the basis upon which we form a conception of our Lady's. When Catholics meditate upon the Passion, they find certain things, which without revelation they would be slow to attribute to the Creator. These then they may fairly attribute to the highest creature, without the least chance of being wrong. Hence if fear, so far as it is a passion, and kept in check by the reason, can be ascribed to Christ; it may also be in the same sense ascribed to Mary. Again, if doubt, so far as it is a temptation only, and not a voluntary act of the reason, can be ascribed to Christ, it is plain that it may in this sense be ascribed to his Mother. Christ we know was in all respects tempted like as we are, except so far as our temptations are the result of sin, original or actual. Representations are placed by Satan before our minds in the hour of death, which lead us to doubt: therefore to say, they were placed before Christ's mind in his agony, is only to say he was tempted in this like as

we are\*. To say the blessed Virgin was overwhelmed with temptations to doubt, need not be a heterodox assertion, if a person only meant thereby, that she allowed Satan to approach her with all manner of representations which tended in that direction. She had power to fix her mind upon the arguments in favour of doubt with which the outward appearance of her Son then supplied her, and to allow Satan to represent them to her—yet power to say, Thus far shall ye go, and no farther: I allow Satan and my own imagination to hold these terrible doubts before me, but I do not allow my reason to consent to them, or adopt conclusions from them. Hence the following language of Paulinus of Nola is perfectly reconcileable with the feelings of the present Church: “The mind of a mother had led her to the cross of the Lord, in whom at the time she was thinking only of the Son of her own body; so that when she saw him dead, she bewailed him by a human weakness, and gathered, that he ought to be buried, without allowing herself any presumption about his resurrection, because the punishment of the Passion, placed before her eyes, cast a film over the faith in the wonder she was afterwards to feel†.” Such lan-

\* Sister Emerich in the beginning of this century had, as has been said above, a series of visions of the Passion: in one of these our Saviour is so exhibited to her. ‘Le doute et l’inquietude, qui précèdent le sacrifice dans l’homme qui se devoue s’éveillèrent dans l’âme du Seigneur: il se fit cette terrible question, Quel sera le profit de ce Sacrifice?’ p. 141. ed. Gall.

† Epist. 50. §. 17. Origen,

Basil, Amphilochus, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Cyril, (ap. Trombelli, diss. xxxviii. qu. 1.) all understand the sword spoken of by Simeon as the sword of doubt. Paulinus is perhaps the only clear Latin authority for this interpretation, though St. Austin also speaks of it. Such a strong and lasting tradition they may set aside who choose. After much reflection on it, it seems to me best, either to own that



guage, or even stronger than this, might reasonably be expected before the existence of formal doctrinal statements upon the subject. It is not language which need scandalize any one who has diligently considered what St. Paul has said of God the Son himself in the days of his flesh. Heretical minds have (as we have seen) perverted this and like passages, and made them imply the absence of that inscrutable unity which subsisted between the two natures in Christ. Perhaps when passages of the Fathers are adduced which seem to imply the absence of that secondary and relative and derived union with God which we ascribe to Mary, a mistake of a similar kind may be committed. They may be clumsily worded statements of a most important truth, viz. that the Passion of Mary was as near a copy of the Creator's Passion as was possible for a creature. Hence the revealed account of our Lord's Passion may be the best possible clue to our Lady's com-passion when the sword passed through her own soul. But as we shall have occasion to return to this subject, I shall only remark here, that I have not called those 'heretical minds' who upon this hypothesis misunderstand the Fathers. If it be better to blaspheme the Son of Man, than that Divine Nature which is one and the same in him and the Holy Ghost, it is so much better to blaspheme the Mother of God, than him who from her became Son of Man, that a mistake about our Lady partakes even less still of the nature of heretical

some unknown truth lies under it, or else to own that the *temptation* to doubt is spoken of in language better suited to the *sin* of doubt. If God, who was perfectly united to his

own soul in Christ, could speak, as if he had forsaken that soul, some licence in speaking of a soul less perfectly united to him in Mary may be allowed the Fathers.



matter. This is not of course determining how close such a mistake may come to heresy, and still less how far he may or may not be guilty of formal heresy, who being pretty nearly certain which God's Church is, yet uses her teaching and practice about his blessed Mother, with an uncertain conscience, as a reason for staying out of her.

## CHAP. VII.

## THE CRUCIFIXION.

1. ALL the events of our Lord's life, in connexion with which our Lady has hitherto been contemplated, appear to look forward to the Crucifixion: they seem calculated, some of them more and some of them less, yet each in its degree, to prepare her for the part in our Redemption she was to bear there. In one sense it is true to say, that Christ trod the winepress alone: just as it is true to say, that God alone creates us<sup>a</sup>. Yet as in creating us he does not dispense with the passions of our parents and that brute estate, which is as it were the star under which our nativity in sin is cast, so in creating us anew he did not dispense with the bitter pains of his own Mother. Hence the holy Fathers style Mary the Mother of all living. Eve was so called, because she was a type of Mary, not because she ever actually was else than the mother of all dying. Just as the mother of Joseph is said in prophecy to come and bow down to him, which she did not do in Egypt, being dead before the time<sup>b</sup> they went down

<sup>a</sup> Compare also the following expressions: 'Dixit Deus' planè dicimus. Dicimus etiam, Dixit propheta. A. Serm. ii. §. 5. So 'Ego sum lux mundi,' and 'vos estis lux mundi.'

<sup>b</sup> Aug. Epist. 199. §. 39. Illum Joseph mater certe adorare non potuit quæ ante de-

functa est quam Jacob venisset ad filium, ut illius somnii prophetici veritas adimplenda Christo Domino servaretur. This reasoning is parallel to St. Epiphanius's. Panar. Hær. lxxviii. §. 18. Given below, chap. xii.

thither, but because even the seeming literal fulfilment of that prophecy was itself but the typical foretelling of a real spiritual fulfilment: so under the name given to Eve, the new Eve was foretold, that as in the old Eve all die, even so in Mary all might be made alive. As none die in the old Adam except through Eve, so none are made alive in Christ except through Mary. Christ is the first-born and the only Son by nature of Mary, all others are his brethren by grace, and by consequence Mary's sons by grace. What then we have to attend to in this chapter, is not the Crucifixion of Christ considered alone and by himself, but the Crucifixion of Christ considered as having Mary at his side, or, in other words, the part then assigned to Mary in the great work of our Redemption. I am aware the bare utterance of such words will be distressing to a protestant reader: such distress happens to the pious protestant from a real love for our Lord, it may be, in several instances. Where such love exists, it will be backward in thinking evil even of those who seem thus recklessly to shock his feelings. One thus backward to think evil, will be glad to see what can be said *for* those who use such language. He will heartily rejoice, if it can be made unmistakeably clear, that instead of taking away from Christ's sole prerogative and dignity, it only tends immeasurably to enhance and illustrate them. For the present, it is hoped he will so far take this assertion upon faith, as to listen to what may be said to prove it.

2. The word 'Crucifixion' is capable of two very distinct meanings: it may mean the act of fixing Jesus to the Cross, or it may mean the state of being crucified. The latter is all it commonly means in

protestant mouths, and that for this plain reason, that nothing is explicitly said in Scripture about the act of crucifying our Lord. But we, who make the Gospel our law, think ourselves bound to aim at not being behind the Old Testament saints in meditating thereon, and consequently endeavouring by devout contemplation to fill out, each in his own way, the outline God has given us. The attempt to do this has reached from the man of ordinary piety up to the beatified and canonized saint. In some instances, persons of this latter sort have put into writing their experiences (so to speak) of what the Holy Ghost spoke in them during meditation. The concordant testimony of persons of eminent sanctity has commanded respect, and their usual mode of viewing and stating things has become, or is in the course of becoming, the received opinion upon many such matters. Still in many also we are at liberty to take such of these accounts of things for our use, as best suit our purposes at the time—as best serve to bring any phase of doctrine contemplated at the time most vividly before us.

3. Now supposing our Lord is to be fixed to a Cross, it is plain the process must go on by some natural mechanical means. He did not crucify himself for us, nor did he order the angels, or suffer the devils, to do it: it was by wicked men's hands that he was fixed<sup>e</sup> to the Cross. These hands nailed

<sup>e</sup> Acts ii. 23. in the Greek. The present Latin text has 'affligentes,' dashing him down, i. e. on to the Cross, instead of 'affigentes,' nailing him to it, which the old editions have in conformity with the Greek, *προσπήξαντες*. The reasons of

this deviation from the Greek, I do not know; but if Latin Mss. justify it, the critics say nothing of it on the Greek text. Only Griesbach conjectures *προσπαίξαντες*, as if he took 'affligentes' in a moral, not a physical, sense. But it seems

him to it with coarse ordinary instruments, regardless of the bluntness of what pierced his hands, or the roughness with which they used their tools. In St. Bridgett's revelations it was shewn to her, that the hands and feet of our blessed Lord were first unmercifully drilled through, and afterwards fixed by nails to the place required. The contraction of the muscles owing to the pain of the sufferers may have rendered it necessary to have the holes for the nails ready before they could drive them into the wood: and the soldiers were more likely to think how they could save themselves trouble, than how they could spare their victims pain. This or some other method necessarily must have been adopted, if the Cross was first erected, and God the Son was afterwards nailed on to it. But the general opinion<sup>d</sup> now is, that Christ was nailed to the Cross upon the ground, and was afterwards moved to the place where he died. A hole was then dug: the Cross was put into it, and the ground beaten in round it with heavy mallets, so as to shake the tree and the Fruit that hung upon it, and to fill him with new and excruciating torments.

4. No doubt his Mother, who had met him before, followed him, and looked on the while. She saw him stripped almost naked: she saw him dashed rudely on to the ground: she saw him hold out his

quite allowable to avail one's self of the reading of all the Greek Mss. There is a similar difficulty about the word קבע in Mal. iii. 9. which means, according to Grammarians, 'to rob:' but St. Jerome's Jew, following tradition, and the Chaldee use of the word, told him it was 'affigere.' A Concordance gives

'affligere' in this passage also.

<sup>d</sup> Gretser de Cruce, i. 21. The places he gives from the Fathers against the received opinion are chiefly figurative, and arose perhaps out of the Greek addition, regnavit Dominus a ligno, where מלך and מעץ seem to have been jumbled together.



hands patiently to be drilled : she saw him with lacerated back dragged along to his hard bed : she saw him laid upon that bed—the rough Cross : she saw him have his arms rudely tugged to make the holes come where they were to be nailed : she saw him fastened first by one hand : she saw one hand after another uncoiled to take the nail, and the muscles, whose animal force had already done homage to the pain, forced to prostrate themselves flat upon the Cross : she saw the left arm tugged to meet the other arm of the Cross from which it shrunk : she saw the feet shrink too, and rudely forced to their place : she saw the precious Blood, all one with God, flow in red streams upon the dust. And oh ! we might well ask, in what school has this woman been, that she looks coolly on ? is she some tigress or lioness athirst for blood, and revelling in the sight of blood, and that too her Son's blood, her God's Blood ? How is it that she has not swooned away ? If this were so, Mary, where is the Mother's heart ? where the bowels of compassion ? are you come to fulfil the prophecy of Deuteronomy before its time, and to feed upon your own child, so far as eyes can feast upon him, and Roman ruffians will allow you ? Indeed, you would have fainted long ago, had not your Son been God, and able in the midst of his sufferings to give out grace and strength, and to obey your command, to enable you to bear up, while you shared his sufferings ; or rather by reflecting them, served as a mirror to increase them in. For when Jesus saw his Mother, he was putting forth as it were every capacity which his sacred humanity had for suffering, and while he obeyed her injunctions to enable her to pass through the whole tragedy, he also gratified his extreme love of suffering

for us by having before his sight the tenderest of mothers. He knew her heart then and all its deepest movements, and enabled her to be with him, not only to augment her merits by her suffering with him, but also to increase his own pain by the sight of her, which helped to keep before him the grief he was innocently inflicting upon her, while he was about his Father's business. The best of women, ever so resigned and ever so habituated to self-command, would have needed some schooling before she could have borne the mere outward sight of her Son's sufferings. Such a schooling the hardships of Bethlehem and Nazareth, the prophecy of Simeon, the flight into Egypt, the loss of Jesus at the pass-over, the parting with him at the commencement of his ministry, the prophetic hint given her at Cana, would prove to Mary. All prepared her for desolation and for suffering.

5. Yet habits would not have been enough for a woman ever so good, without present grace, to enable her to stand, and that her Son poured into her, nerving her for suffering when she wished to suffer, agonizing her for desolation when she wished to be disconsolate; still she had learned obedience to the law of 'suffering first and glory after' by what she suffered: she practised that obedience now. It required a supernatural strength to enable a Mother to gaze upon what she saw: otherwise she would be destitute of natural feelings. Yet you say she was only a good woman: accept then this alternative, either that she was brutal and unfeeling on this occasion, or else that now at least she was in some manner or other endued with supernatural strength. If she was not born with it, she gained it by habit: if she had it by habit, still she needed a constant supply

of grace at the time to bear up under a sight so dreadful to a Mother's feelings. If you are so unwilling to admit something supernatural even in God's Mother, you must have some theory to shew how a good woman came to bear up under the sight before her without fainting away. The theory of habits then, formed by constant intercourse with suffering and by conversation about the Passion at Nazareth, ought to be most acceptable to you, as being the only natural account by which you can shew that this good woman was not without natural affection. Even if you dismiss some of what is here said as 'wise above what is written,' still the account of Mary's conduct actually detailed in Scripture implies an immense amount of grace gained by habit, or by some other way: for in no other manner could an affectionate Mother gaze on a bleeding Son so long. If she was to suffer with Christ in some special manner, then we see why he should have dealt as he did with his Mother. But it is quite certain, that either Jesus and Mary had hearts wholly unlike human hearts, or else that without Mary the Passion could not have been what it was. God might have saved us some other way; but the question is, how he did save us: and a part of the answer is, by having a Mother there to render his sufferings acute enough to save such hard-hearted wretches as we are, who yet feel tenderness for a mother, as long as any good feeling is left in us. If Mary had not been there, it is plain that all those redemptive pangs, which the consciousness of her tender affection to himself and to us occasioned, could not have existed as they then did. Who can say, that the particular pain which cut the heart of Jesus, owing to this consciousness, was not the very

one which rove that heart with such acuteness as to take his life away at last? Yet without asserting this, the presence of one whose thoughts of him and of us he knew so well, would be enough to occasion most acute pain.

6. That she retained even at a later period her habits of influencing Jesus, may be seen from considering the conversion of the penitent thief. The Scripture account of this requires some tradition to clear it up: for St. Mathew says, ‘the *thieves* also which were crucified with him reproached him’ with the same thing as the scribes and elders. And St. Mark gives the same account: therefore we want some cause to explain how it came about that St. Dimas repented. If no cause can be found, there will be either a careless account upon the part of these two Evangelists, or else St. Luke flatly contradicts them. Now it is an ancient tradition, that the penitent thief<sup>e</sup> was on the right hand of the Cross, and it seems likely that Mary, if she moved about, would yet stand most upon that side, as St. John would feel it the place of honour, and yield it to her. St. Ephrem<sup>f</sup> attributes the conversion of the thief to her intercession; and the blessed Emerich, as was noticed above, was shewn in a vision, that the mother of that thief had been kind and hospitable to Mary upon her journey into Egypt. These things put together make it intelligible, how, though both the thieves blasphemed at first, one was afterwards converted. Mary interceded with Jesus for a person in whom she felt interested through motives of gratitude<sup>g</sup>. Of course the predestination of God will account for any change in any sinner:

<sup>e</sup> Gretser. l. c. p. 186. lib. ii. below, chap. xii.

cap. 4.

<sup>g</sup> See above, chap. iv. fin.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. iii. p. 572. d. given and chap. ii. §. 16. n. z.



but we are here enquiring, by what means that predestination took effect. When St. Paul was converted, it may be referred to the predestination of God: but this does not prevent, but that St. Stephen's intercession may have had a great deal to do with it. Be this as it may, the statement just made serves to indicate what sort of power St. Ephrem ascribed to the blessed Virgin: admit it, and you can at once explain the apparent discrepancy between the Evangelists. Both thieves blasphemed till Mary prayed, and one was converted when she prayed. Observe then how we are again led round to the same conclusion. For it may be said, that admitting the truth of this view of the penitent thief's conversion, admitting that a look of Mary's at the thief, when noticed by Jesus, or a touch of a single hair of Mary's, was enough to wound<sup>h</sup> his heart with thoughts of mercy, still there is nothing after all so wonderful in her gratitude exerting itself in this way. When she had perhaps been received into the thief's mother's house, and treated with all that sweetness of hospitality which easily induces one to believe without reasoning, that we are in a home among love as good as mothers or sisters or brothers give; what marvel would it be if one plied God with constant prayers and tender offerings for one of that house astray from the fold? This is what an ordinary Christian would have done. The marvel then lies not in the gratitude of Mary, supposing the story true, but in the calmness and self-possession of that tender Mother, who, with her Son bleeding to death upon the Cross before her eyes, still prayed to him as God of God,

<sup>h</sup> Vulnerasti cor meum soror      rum et in uno crine colli tui.  
 mea sponsa, vulnerasti cor      Cant. iv. 9.  
 meum in uno oculorum tuo-



very God, and did not faint, sick with the sin which God so fearfully was redeeming.

7. This was a calm perfectly prodigious, supernatural, and miraculous. No parallel can be found to it, except in Jesus who outdid it. Whatever sorrow, distress, or temptation could be heaped upon a human soul, was heaped on Jesus in his agony: yet a while after he is calm. He has to go through his trial, and he betrays no mark of that bewilderment which he allowed to take possession of him in the garden. He bequeaths his Mother calmly on the cross to St. John. Again, when he pleases he is forsaken by God, and shuts out from himself the beatific vision so far as present consciousness is concerned. Why should he not have made his Mother to share his cup as much as possible in this? If some of the holy Fathers appear to present us with so different a portrait of Mary to what others present us with, may it not reasonably be said that they took the likeness at different moments, one when she willed to be calm and interceding with God the Son for sinners, another when she willed to be overwhelmed with sorrow, and allow, though without consent, the access of temptations to doubt and despair. As then all that Jesus suffered was suffered at his own sweet will, and the torrent of his Agony and Passion flowed, or was stanchèd, just as he chose, so he may have given to Mary to have such a commanding will over those affections and temptations, as allowed or forbade their access as

<sup>i</sup> Quando turbatur qui non turbaretur nisi volens, eum consolatur qui turbatur et nolens. Pereant argumenta philosophorum qui negant in

sapientem cadere perturbationes animorum! Stultam fecit Deus sapientiam hujus mundi! A. in Jo. lx. 2.

she chose. As he received comfort from an Angel, so she might be comforted by that great Saint whose homage even an Angel declined. What St. Ephrem says then of her intercession, (whether it seem true or not,) serves at least to bring clearly before us the preternatural calm of Mary, which preternatural calm throws into a strong relief that state in which she needed comfort at St. John's hands. The alternations of calm and agony make the blessed Virgin like our Lord: if she had them at her own will by a gift from her Son, this very power of either bearing or sinking under the cross as she pleased, qualified her in an eminent way for cooperating in our Redemption with her Son. If her feelings were not at her command, then it is hard to account for her conduct, and to explain how it was not unnatural, instead of being preternatural, to continue there without fainting away. If she was preternaturally calm, why not also agonized by a preternatural desolation as like as possible to Christ's dereliction?

8. With these remarks before us, it is easy to see how much might be said of Mary at the Crucifixion, and the part she bore in our Redemption there. But the distinct office there conferred upon her, is so important to our Salvation, that the next chapter shall be devoted to the consideration of it. There is however an event which ought not to pass unnoticed here, from the effect it would have upon any mother's mind who witnessed it: I mean, the division of Christ's garments among the soldiers. From what we know of the treatment of criminals in this country, it is not unlikely that the soldiers thought somewhat as follows: "If we manage well, we shall sell this Fellow's garments at a good round sum: let us each have a bit: let us divide fair.

One perhaps more knowing than the rest would say; I say, look at this vestment: it is pity to cut it up, it is such a curious piece of work. It would fetch a large price whole, to what it would cut up. Suppose we tossed up who should have it. A good thought, cried one. That we will, said another. Here's for it, then, said a third. So they tossed up for the notable Prisoner's clothes, and thought only what they should be in pocket by them." This is about the world's view of relics,—curiosities which will fetch a good price: a view stated here in as coarse language as possible, on purpose to contrast it with a penitent's feelings, a disciple's affection, and a Mother's love. The Magdalen would have heard with horror what they said, and seen with horror what they did, with clothes she had wept over so tenderly. John, who perhaps had washed them many a time, and seen the woman touch them when virtue went out of them, would have felt, I cannot say how; but not as a protestant does about relics. If not bowed down with sorrow, perhaps he would have wished that Nicodemus, or Joseph of Arimathea, or Susanna the wife of Chuza, or some rich disciple, would buy them. Mary, who read perhaps their hearts, and saw them rending while these precious relics were rent, how would she have felt, she that had doubtless made or mended them ere now, and knew the value of the Blood upon them? Let mothers say how they would have felt, and measure first by the recoil of natural feelings from such a sight the acuteness of Mary's suffering. Then let them step closer, and gaze at this vestment and these garments. 'Why,' let them ask with Isaias, 'is thy apparel red, and thy garments like theirs that tread the wine-press,' thou that hast been in Geth-

semane, the press of oil<sup>k</sup>, not the press of wine? What Blood is this, but 'that which the faithful know to be the price of our redemption'<sup>1</sup>? How then could you bear to see your Saviour's Blood, warm almost and fresh from his body, in the hands of paynim soldiers, swearing and betting over his garments, and gambling them away? I doubt if the most hardened protestant could stand the sight of so precious a relic in such odious ruffians' hands. But *he* did not give Christ his flesh, *he* never had him leaning on his breast to suck, *he* had not taught him to say 'Mary' with his infant lips, *he* had not watched him sleeping in his cradle, *he* had not noticed all his little ways as he grew up, *he* had not treasured up his sayings, talked familiarly with him about the Passion, kissed him when he left his home, wept when his back was turned, nor seen him fainting under his Cross. Ah! if we could bring a tender mother's heart to all these things, and linger round them till they had whispered one after another as it were their secret feelings to us, even then how little should we know of Mary's feelings! She knew these precious relics would be rescued, yet she had power to fix her mind intently upon the thought that they were now in the hands of wicked men, which just before had fingered the gored hands and feet of Jehovah the Son of Mary, as they nailed him rudely to his Cross. Alas, poor Mother! see now whether this be thy Son's coat, or not! see in whose hands it is! see where he allows his precious Blood to travel, that he may save us!

<sup>k</sup> נח-שמניא. I am aware a contraction to explain the Jerome gives another interpretation: but t and d are too often interchanged to make it necessary to have recourse to Syriac form. See Pfeiffer Op. p. 479. and Gesen. Lex. in v. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Epist. xliii. 23.

and beg him at least to give us grace to feel for you, and the humility to understand, that we cannot fathom the ocean of sorrows that overwhelms you, the miraculous calm of your agonized soul, or the prodigious horrors you have suffered to approach you, in order to win our redemption !



## CHAP. VIII.

## THE CRUCIFIXION CONTINUED.

1. IT has been attempted in the last chapter to shew, that if Mary's conduct was not cruel and unnatural in holding out firm under the sight of God's sufferings, it was altogether and throughout supernatural. Any mother of ordinary tenderness of heart must otherwise have sunk under it. But she was not the only person whose conduct requires some theory of this sort to explain it. There was a youth there who had left his home to follow Jesus, who had been admitted to his friendship and love in a most distinguished manner, and had had that love so stamped upon himself, that he who wished to learn from holy writ what love is, would select his writings as containing the clearest inspired teaching upon the subject. Next to the blessed Virgin herself, Jesus seems to have loved him most: perhaps he is next to her in purity, and next to her in ability to rescue from contrary temptations: next also to her in ability to grasp and teach the profound doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The great doctor of the Incarnation and the great doctor of grace have each left us a long commentary upon his Gospel. It seems as though Jesus had a sort of partiality for his very name, and he had written the name of John oftener in the book of life than that of any other Saint. We see in Scripture a sort of delicacy of feeling in St. John, which is not to be

found perhaps in the other Apostles : this may be instanced in his respectfulness to St. Peter. He waits for St. Peter to suggest it before he asks Jesus who is the traitor : he sacrifices his own desire to keep close to Jesus, in order to go out and bring in St. Peter, whose burning love he knew so well : he waits again for St. Peter to look into the tomb before himself when he had outrun him, as if reproaching himself for taking advantage of his own youth in so outrunning the prince of the Apostles. Possibly he was of somewhat gentler extraction than several of the Apostles : for we find his father had ‘hired men’<sup>a</sup> under him, and in the text more immediately before us, we find he had a home of his own in Jerusalem : moreover, he was known to the high priest, which seems to mark a higher grade of life than that of the other fishermen. The qualifications of refinement of feeling and of possessing a home may be looked upon as natural qualifications, fitting him in some measure to have the charge of our blessed Lady, when her Son was dead. Yet they are at the same time just the qualifications which would make him feel our Saviour’s sufferings most acutely : the utter loss of every thing he saw in God the Son, who had no where to lay his head on the Cross, would reproach him for possessing a home : the dire and blasphemous ill-usage of him he loved, would keenly cut that tender heart, which saw the breast of Jesus there, but could not lie upon it, as it did a little while before, when he was going to ordain him a priest. The natural qualifications of St. John then were such as to lead us to suppose he required some supernatural support to enable him to stand when St. Peter fell.

<sup>a</sup> Mark i. 20. comp. Luke xv. 17.

2. His supernatural qualifications lead us to the same conclusion. So great was his purity of heart, that no Christian has I believe ever accused him of sin. He himself says, 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.' But who else can be found to say St. John had sin such as man could take cognizance of? This purity of heart is what enables to see God. Now in proportion as John saw God in Jesus, in that proportion the extreme humiliation of God the Son would be afflicting and bewildering to him. How could he come now to lay aside his respect for St. Peter, and think himself worthy to stay when St. Peter was gone? St. Peter had been prepared for this as much as himself; he had heard Christ foretell it: he had seen his glory on the mount with St. John: he had been as close to him as St. John when he suffered his Agony: if the revelation of glory on mount Thabor had been given to St. John to nerve his courage for the sight now before him, so had it been also given to St. Peter. It is neither in accordance with what have been here called his natural gifts, nor with his supernatural gifts, for him to stay when St. Peter had gone. It requires a distinct supernatural gift and inspiration to enable him to do so. Neither can we suppose that his love for his Master's Mother put St. Peter out of his mind. For this would be to suppose that it put Jesus out of his mind also.

3. The question is, how came he to be able to bear the sight of his beloved Master so calmly, as to linger on there when St. Peter was gone; how came he to gaze on God the Son in agony so patiently? If his unsuspecting innocence and purity was such, that he mingled with the women in the dark, mindless of what lewd heathen soldiers would have said,

that very purity would enable him to see God. The darkness was no darkness to him, and the night as light as the day to that soul of purity to whom the Lord God and the Lamb were the light. Some special grace had armed him for that sight, and called him to the spot, asleep to the storm around him, and entranced in the vision of the Almighty hanging on the Cross, with his eyes open to behold Mary in the midst of all her desolation and her agony. Of all men whom his Master was lifted up to draw to himself, St. John was the sole representative. If we do not look upon him as our representative, we have no male to stand for us, and the Cross, even when actually suffered, had not actually that power that was promised to it. Whatever we might hope from it as it was suffered, St. John stands alone as the voucher, at the time, that it had the power which was promised to it. It is not then an absurdity to take St. John at that time as the representative of the whole race of Christians. What was said to him, was said to all, and for all.

4. Next, it is no slight preeminence to be the favourite of God made flesh. If we take a glance back into God's predestinating love, and view him as planning our Redemption, we shall see him planning first his own sacred humanity, next, and nearest to it, Mary's. But to whom can we give the next place, if we do not give it to that disciple whom Jesus loved? He has planned beforehand all the good works his saints are to walk in: and shall we think his own sacred humanity was led by random fancy and chance feelings of the hour, to concentrate its own unsearchable affections upon one man more than another? He knew all his members, while as

yet there was none of them made; he who before his birth as man would so often have gathered Jerusalem's children as a hen her chickens under his wing, surely did not, when he came, deal out his human love irrespectively of his divine foreknowledge and predestination. Without then insisting upon what we cannot be sure, viz. that of all the saints of this earth John came nearest to Mary in the book of the predestinate, still it is clear we cannot regard the love of Jesus to him as the friendship of a few years only, but as something which, while we view it floating on the surface of Christ's life on earth, yet has its reflection in the deep ocean of his eternal Person as God. God is love, says St. John, and Love incarnate had him for his beloved disciple. We may expect then that from this love something would come, marvellous and supernatural in its character. Is it much to say, that a divine inspiration was breathed forth from it into St. John, and the unction of courage too, a gift bestowed even on the r negade Saul<sup>b</sup>? Armed with these, St. John is able to endure the sight of his Master on the Cross: he is invited to his Master's death-bed, to be our representative there, and to obtain a legacy in the name of us all. Jesus was not stupified by the chalice of his Passion: he knew the mysterious dereliction just about to follow, and before it came he gave St. John his legacy. Just before he shut out from his own sacred soul all the sweets of the present consciousness of its immutable union with God, and let in the night upon himself, still awake as it were to his own dignity, he gives a gift to his greatest friend, his beloved disciple.

5. Let us try to mingle now awhile among the

<sup>b</sup> St. Ephrem in 1 Reg. p. 352. A. p. 366. A.



heathen crowd, and hearken to their words. 'The deceiver there is mumbling something or other to one of his misguided followers: by the way, the rascals we saw oftenest with him are all off; there is one nice looking young man there, that I think I've seen with him.' 'Yes,' says another, 'it was a pet disciple.' 'And that woman there, they say it is the fanatic's mother; I dare say he is coaxing the youth to take care of her, now he has caught it himself for stirring up the people.' 'Well, well; I am glad to see the fellow had some natural feeling in him. She must have been a good looking woman in her day; but her beauty is the worse for wear now. Poor old woman! I dare say she flattered herself her Son would cut a figure in the world, and she would be an excellent person to curry favour with.' 'Ha, ha, ha! she is out there, though.' 'I hope she will have the good sense to get out of the way, else she will find our rulers a little sharper upon impostors than she likes.' 'They tell me, she's rather smitten with that young fellow; but I suppose this is not a very good time for making love: however, there's no saying—disappointed people will sometimes take up with any thing, when they can't get the object of their ambition.' 'It is getting uncommonly dark, it must be later than I thought for: well, the execution is over now pretty well: I feel no interest in a lot of sobbing women, so I am for going home. There are sure to be plenty of people to tell us, if he has any juggling trick to get down from the Cross; but I should think he's safe enough now. Suppose we follow his disciples' example, and leave him to hang by himself; for I see the last of them is making off now with the old

mother there. There they go, see ! It is very dark, we will be off too.'

6. It is good sometimes to put coarsely before us thus our need of divine grace to find Jesus, the hard unfeeling way in which unnatural nature, left to itself, would talk both of him, and of his Mother, and of his friends. Yet it would be well, if some of our countrymen would consider whether part of this language is as shocking to them as it ought to be. The crowd do not believe Jesus to be God, and therefore naturally enough talk thus of his Mother : they have no interest in what he says to his disciple, and do not care whether they hear it, or not. But Catholics are at a loss to conceive, how it can be possible for a person to believe Jesus to be God, and yet not to be interested in what he says to his disciple and his Mother before he dies. They are naturally tempted to think, that those who do not hold the conclusion, are 'not essentially, but by circumstance,' believers in the premiss. Almighty God, having taken flesh, died for man on the Cross. This flesh he created not out of the earth as Adam's, but out of a woman. Almighty God on his death-bed the Cross spoke of that woman, and to that woman. The dying words of Almighty God are surely words of some tremendous import to our salvation, are words of thunder to the son of thunder<sup>c</sup>. As soon as he had brought that flesh to sufficient perfection to be born of that woman, it is declared that he was her first-born Son. Now that he has brought that flesh to the consummation of

<sup>c</sup> Quam filio tonitruui  
Crucis tonans de vertice

Commendat Auctor ætheris  
Ut virgo servet virginem.

Bede, Hymn ii. p. 95.

suffering, he tells that woman that John, the representative of us all, is her son. Surely this begets an apprehension in us that Mary *is* the Mother of all living, as the Fathers style her, and that Jesus is but the first-born among many brethren. "For one may venture to call the Gospels the prime of all the Scriptures, and that of St. John the prime of all the Gospels, the meaning of which Gospel no one can attain to, without reclining upon the breast of Jesus, and without receiving from Jesus Mary to be his Mother also. And he that is to be another John, ought to have become such as to be capable of being, like John, pointed to by Jesus, as if Jesus. For if there be no Son of Mary, according to those who hold right doctrine about her, but Jesus, and Jesus says to his Mother, 'Behold thy Son!' and not, 'Behold, this also is thy Son,' he says as much as, 'This is Jesus, of whom you are Mother<sup>d</sup>.'" Such, though quaintly put, was the language of early times. If our times could be brought up to the foot of the Cross, could any person, calling himself a Christian, step forward to the dying Jesus, and say, 'I firmly believe it is a matter of indifference, whether or no you give me a share in St. John's privileges: be so good as to make me a beloved disciple, but not a son of Mary, if you please.' To do so, would be to insult Almighty God upon his death-bed. Surely I may hope those who are more noble than to insult a dying man even in this way, will say, 'We will hear thee farther concerning this matter.'

<sup>d</sup> Origen in Joan. i. §. 6. Dam. F. O. iv. 14 fin. Canis. iv. See also Epiphan. Hær. lxxviii. 14. St. Ephr. O. T. p. 36. y. §. 18. August. de Sanct. Virginit. §. 6. quoted below, p. 93. p. 85. e. and Cyril quoted in vol. i. p. 363. e. may also be Petr. Chrysol. Serm. cxi. Jo. referred to.

7. Observe then that Jesus first says to Mary, 'Behold thy Son:' he first enstates St. John in the privilege of sonship to Mary, before he informs him that he is to treat her as a Mother. He commends John to Mary, before he commends Mary to St. John. Now I suppose this may be taken as the act which formally installed Mary in the office of Mother of the elect. Before her appointment to this office, she had long had all the qualifications for it. It is too absurd to suppose she was fit to be Mother of God, and not fit to be Mother of men: but it is one thing to be fitted for an office, and another to be actually installed in it. Nevertheless, the fact that she had been Mother of God for three and thirty years, qualified her in a special manner for being the Mother of men in the sense here intended. If she was a good woman, she was capable of gaining by habit: if she was intended to gain authoritative influence with Jesus by habit, then we can see how his apparent idling away his time at Nazareth, when a world was waiting to be redeemed, is to be explained. If Mary was in fact to be put into very high authority over the elect, there is no absurdity in the conduct of Jesus, nothing inexplicable in all this delay, even upon the supposition Mary was but a good woman at the first. When a clear definite reason for God's conduct can be assigned, from the fact that we are capable of habits, taken in connection with the fact that Mary is held by the largest body of Christians to have that high authority, it is absurd to turn round and say, we had rather believe God to have acted unaccountably, than Mary to have such power. The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, and what she asserts of Mary, while it explains why God was born of a woman and not of the earth

as Adam was, explains also why the favourite disciple should have her given to him for a Mother. If there was one person whom Jesus loved above all his other subjects, it is natural that he should select him to be the open and visible recipient of graces intended for all. He had been ordained a little before, and there was no stain of flight upon his ordination graces, none of denial of Christ. The grace which had selected him, watched him, and kept him close to Christ till he was put safely into his Mother's hands. This was not the whim of a dying man, but the deliberate judgment of a dying God, to make one who had corresponded to his graces the Son of Mary. It would be hard if the affectionate mother of Zebedee's children, with all her earnest anxiety, could not obtain one place for one of her sons. The right hand was given to Mary, for whom it was prepared, but St. John did obtain the left. The younger, as in many other instances, was preferred before the elder. We see then what Love incarnate bequeathed to his beloved disciple on the death-bed of the Cross—Mary for a Mother. The other disciples are away at the very moment when they ought to be there to envy him most.

8. But if we come to examine this bequest, and try to ascertain its value, it will be then that we shall see what great reason we should have to be jealous of St. John, if he had not received this merely as an outward representative of all who draw from this inexhaustible treasury. St. John could not enter his mother's womb again and be born; but Christ had promised, that no man left mother for him, but he should receive a hundred fold more in this life



present\*. Now was the time for him to fulfil this promise; it was becoming for him who had, by virtue of his human nature, sunk as low as Satan himself could have coveted without sin, that he should, in the very midst of that degradation, put forth the plenitude of his divine justice and mercy. ‘Amen I say unto you’, had bound him by justice to fulfil his promise of mercy. How then could he do this, if the door of Mary’s womb was shut, because the Lord God of Israel had entered in by it? Was he like Darius the Mede, who foolishly made a law which bound himself to the injury of his own guileless favourite, when he decreed to shut up Mary’s womb? Or, how could his promise stand? Here is a difficulty, which the belief in Mary’s Maternity rightly explained will solve. He was God: he it was who created woman such as she is, not only with physical capacities for conceiving children, but also with all those tender maternal feelings towards her children which she has. As he retained his Godship on the Cross, he retained his Creatorship, and it was within the scope of his divine power, without abrogating the law of Mary’s ever-virginity, to create in her breast feelings of love for St. John, an hundredfold more strong than his own mother after the flesh felt for him. It became the Creator of the world, without whom was not any thing made that was made, who was now writhing upon his Cross, to reward in a dignified manner both John who had followed him, and Mary who had given him flesh, nourishment, feelings; in

\* August. in Joan. tr. cxix. §. 3. ‘Habebat ille discipulus centupliciter plura quam dimiserat, in quæ susciperet ejus Matrem qui illa donaverat. Sed

in ea societate beatus Joannes receperat centuplum ubi nemo dicebat aliquid suum.’

† Mark x. 29.

a word, every thing that enabled him to suffer for sinners whom he loved. As this mode of our redemption would have been impossible without Mary, as she had<sup>g</sup> had so large a share in ministering to him all the materials of bodily and mental agony without sin on her part: he then created her Mother of the elect, by giving her bowels of compassion for all men: he gave her from the royal throne of suffering as the Captain of our salvation, the honours due to her for following him so closely in his agony and passion. Already she had had opportunities of doing more for our salvation by prayer, and by arguing with Jesus in his retirement, than any creature ever had done, and this deserved an immense reward. But her Son was God, and God (says St. Austin) ‘makes one that finds him more capacious, that he may seek again to be filled, the instant he has begun to be capable of holding more<sup>h</sup>.’ It became a dying God to bequeath, as far as he could, his own bowels of compassion for sinners to his benefactress and his Mother. It may have been foolishness in God to make himself indebted to a woman, but it would be yet greater foolishness not to have foreseen what would be the consequences of so doing. Either let us boldly deny that he was born of the Virgin Mary, or consistently affirm, that having these powers to make her more capacious of likeness to himself, he remained a dutiful Son to the end of his days.

9. All who reflect must acknowledge, that in

<sup>g</sup> Aug. de Virginit. 6. Plane Mater fuit membrorum ejus, quod nos sumus, quia cooperata est caritate, ut fideles in Ecclesiâ nascerentur qui illius capitis membra sunt. ap. Tromb. v.

p. 17. Nobis salutem conferant Deiparæ tot lacrymæ, quibus lavare sufficis totius orbis crimina! Hymn at Laud's of Fest. vii. Dolor. Septemb.

<sup>h</sup> In Jo. tr. lxiii. §. 1.

consigning John to Mary, Jesus set an example of love to friends upon our death-beds; and in consigning Mary to John, an example of love to parents. But here the process is reversed in part, and we have been contending, that, considering who Jesus was and who Mary was, the former act was an example of love not to John only, but to Mary also. He constituted her participatrix in our redemption, by bequeathing to her as a son the dearest object of his affections, except herself. He made her a Mother to him, by giving her a heart of love as nearly as possible like to his own heart, which loved St. John to the end<sup>i</sup>. As in the creation of children after the flesh, the debasing pleasures through which we are by a sore judgment born into the world, are the same nearly in both parents: so in this case the pains of Jesus and Mary are as nearly alike as circumstances admit. As theologians are of opinion that the sin of Adam was greater than that of Eve, so the pain of Jesus is greater than that of Mary. As pain belongs to a woman who brings forth children in sin, so Mary now was filled with pain and sorrow, and became the Mother of us all, by no less a paroxysm of pain than the agony, spiritual martyrdom, and desolation, which she felt at the death of Jesus her God and her Son. The very intensity of her feeling for Jesus, filled her with such a quick and pain-striking love for those he loved, for sinners, for our own selves, that this intense love itself deserved the highest honour God her Son could give her. No greater honour can be found than that she should be made the way to Christ for all henceforward, as Christ was the way to God. Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the

<sup>i</sup> John xiii. 1.

Lord. Mercy is mine, I will intercede, says his Mother. This may be looked upon as putting the feelings of Catholics towards Mary in the broadest possible light: and therefore it is hoped, that now it is perfectly plain, that in making her the co-operatrix of our redemption, we do but honour Christ the more. For what else do we than represent him at the lowest ebb of that majestic power which shone forth in him, as able to confer upon his Mother a gift of the most transcendent and winning majesty? Plainly we make him the giver and her the recipient, him the source and her the channel. Him we have made, in the most absolute sense, full of grace from the first: her only in such sense full, as not to be incapable after thirty years of close and intimate access to the source of grace, of being dilated so as to receive a new and extraordinary gift. If from that Passion dead bodies of the saints gained a power of appearing to many, surely it is not too much for it to give to the living heart of Mary the gift of Maternity over all the elect! Many prophets and just men desired to see the things which she saw, and did not see them; and to hear the things which she heard at Nazareth, and did not hear them. David had often protected Jerusalem with his prayers, and for his sake it was not destroyed. It was fitting therefore that the new Jerusalem should be placed under Mary's patronage and protection, and that the Mother should have a greater honour than the remote ancestor of Christ, the sharer of his griefs a more excellent glory than the type of them.

10. But it may be said, if this doctrine be true, the case of those who die in ignorance or dislike of the privileges attributed to Mary is truly awful. For



at this rate they will be despising not man but God, and setting aside his ordinance, and trying to climb up to him some other way instead of that one which he has appointed on the Cross, and hallowed with the sanction of his dying breath. To this I reply, that, putting this objection at its highest, all we see of God's dealings in the natural or moral world, would lead us to think him very wasteful, so to express it, if we did not remember his sovereign power to create fresh creatures in place of those he has suffered to perish. Certainly we cannot explain how, with power to bring not only seeds but inchoate animals and men to perfection, he yet seems so often to throw them away; or how it is consistent with his goodness to supply and bless nourishment for those who will only grow up to damn themselves, and to send eternal souls into the world by roads, in which their baptism is sure, humanly speaking, to be precluded. Supposing then it were the doctrine of the Church, that no person who had come to years of discretion could possibly be saved without recourse to Mary, even this terrible aspect of things would be very far from wanting strong analogies to support it. God could not be judged for not giving men grace to come to Mary, any more than he can be judged for not giving them grace to come to the Sacraments. Certainly such a theory as this would put us under strong obligations of charity to try and persuade men to come to Mary, but it would not be an absurd or inconsistent theory. It is useful to notice this, that people may not suppose that there can by no possibility be instances where God will punish men very severely indeed for not having recourse to his sacred Mother to remove their doubts, and to obtain them other graces. Nay



it is possible that in certain instances he may treat persons capable of reflecting upon it, as guilty of the great insult of condemning himself of foolishness for having a mother at all; so intensely irrational does it seem to admit, that God took flesh of a woman, and gave her no privileges in consequence!

11. But a more kindly and merciful view of this may be taken, if we consider the office of a natural mother towards her children, as a clue to that of this supernatural Mother. Now a mother watches the child, when it is in that stupid night of ignorance, and that brute-like state, which the fall has brought upon us. She prays for it: she does for it numberless offices of which the child is quite unconscious, nay, at which it shews signs of anger, peevishness, and jealousy. And what infancy is to this life, that our whole life is to the world to come<sup>k</sup>. Mary may watch with motherly anxiety then over souls out of the reach of the light of faith, may intercede for them, and check them through the graces she earns for them amid their natural waywardness and lust. We see that in nature some children are more precocious even to a surprising degree than others, and so it is in grace. Some are allowed to recognise that loving parent early in the stage of their existence; others are not allowed to see her hand over them till the infancy of their existence is gone by. Yet all who now have the life of God in them, will in the end find Mary to be the Mother of all living. Still if an affectionate intercourse between

<sup>k</sup> Bacon. de Augm. Scient. vii. l. p. 348. Quemadmodum Aristoteles ait adolescentes posse etiam beatos esse, sed non aliter quam spe; eodem modo Christiani fide edocti

debemus nos omnes minorum et adolescentium loco statuere, ut non aliam felicitatem cogitemus quam quæ in spe sita est.

Mary and any Christian comes to light in this life, it is proper to put that trust in it as a sign of predestination<sup>1</sup>, which it will be found our writers have done.

12. Somewhat of this kind is the gift of Maternity which our Saviour bestowed upon his Mother from the Cross, and thereby made her perhaps in such sense our spiritual Mother, that without her we should have no spiritual existence at all. It remains to consider what he may have meant by intimating to St. John the duty of treating her as a Mother, which seems to have been sufficiently implied in the words he had already used to his Mother. The consideration of this may be most fitly introduced by words taken from a passage of St. Cyril, which has given great, and perhaps unnecessary, scandal to many of our divines. "When his own Mother," says the great champion of the Theotocos, "had fallen in with a scandal, and was confused with a derangement of thoughts, how could the Lord do else than provide for her? For being really God, and seeing the movements of the heart, and knowing what was at the bottom of the same, how could he be ignorant of the thoughts over the venerable Cross, which at that moment of time chiefly disturbed her? Knowing then the reflections which were then in her, he gave her over to his disciple, as the best expounder of mysteries, and as one able well and sufficiently to expound the depth of the mystery. For he was indeed wise, and 'a divine!' who then received her, and conveyed her gladly thence, to fulfil all the Saviour's will concerning

<sup>1</sup> Vide Recupitus de Signis to be better known in this  
Prædest. p. 342 sq. This ad- country.  
mirable *practical* book deserves

her<sup>m</sup>." If we try how this passage will fit on to our Saviour himself, by going back to the garden, there is, methinks, in it nothing to scandalize, but much to edify us. 'When his own Son, we might say of the Father, had fallen in with a scandal, and was confused with a derangement of thoughts, so that he wished his chalice to pass from him, how could the Father do else than provide for him? For being really God, how could he be ignorant of the thoughts of the venerable Cross, which at that moment chiefly disturbed him? Knowing then the reflections then in him, he gave him over (say) to St. Michael, as the best expounder of mysteries, and as one well able to set before him the end and issue of the mystery. For he was indeed wise, and a beholder of God, who came and gave him strength<sup>n</sup> to turn from his sorrowful thoughts to the fulfilling of his Father's will, and the glory which should follow.' Certainly, if this were so put, the words would not be far off from an orthodox statement of what really happened. And if it be true, that Mary was made as like as possible to Jesus in suffering, then at some period or other she must have been reduced to a state which needed the ministry of an inferior<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> In Joan. p. 1066. Compare Sister Emerich's statement referred to above, p. 65. n. e. and Cyril's words quoted in the Sixth Council, Hard. iii. p. 1196. e. *ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὑποδουλιῶν ἡρέμα τὸν παρὰ φύσιν τε καὶ ἐξ ἀρᾶς εἰσβεβηκότα θάνατον, διαπτύων δὲ πάλιν ὡς Θεὸς τὸ (l. τῷ) οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω κ. τ. λ.* and (in Jo. p. 703. d.) *ibid.* p. 1220. p. 1217.

<sup>n</sup> I have denied before that either *ἐνισχύω* or *conforto* ever mean to comfort, except indirectly. The Syriac *ܐܡܪܝܢܐ*,

and Coptic, and Æthiopic, coincide with this; and they, with the Latin, are all the versions worth primary consideration, as the others are drawn from them. The word does not occur, Wetstein says, except in the LXX, and they use it in Daniel x. 18. of the Angel, who certainly did not comfort him by words only, but by communicating strength as he spoke.

<sup>o</sup> *Quid miraris quia Maria dolebat tunc, quum ipse Do-*

And when would she need it so much as when Jesus was dead, when God was buried in body, and in soul descended to hell? This then does not disgrace Mary, however much it honours St. John. I will not assert what is not in itself improbable, that St. John might have had the care of the blessed Sacrament, if it be true that Jesus reserved it after the first Mass<sup>p</sup>; but he must have had some special graces in virtue of the priesthood, through which he was privileged to comfort the afflicted, and thus to be a type of the right that priests have to comfort others much more holy than themselves, when it pleases God to leave them in dryness and desolation. For all the sufferings of Mary, from her trouble at the sight of the angel Gabriel up to the last dread desolation, seem specially shaped with a view to the consolation of eminently holy souls.

13. This statement of the case plainly amounts to supposing, that by a special interposition of divine grace St. John was enabled to administer strength to our blessed Lady, at a time when, to make her as like as possible to Jesus, she was stripped of all sensible consolation. The pang by which this dolorous Mother bore us, was great as the sea. John might have been inspired to remind her in the midst of it of her former privileges, her creation, her Maternity to God incarnate, her intimate and

minus flebat? to apply what is said upon another subject by St. Augustine. Serm. 173. §. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Possibly the two other Maries, present at the Crucifixion, tended by their names to remind our Lady of the Sacrament, or at least of the

elements from which it is made. Mary Cle-opha, and Mary Magdalene, i. e. Mary of the baker's tools, and Mary of the wine-press. The root of Magdal, means to twist (torquere), thence probably a wine-press (torcular), a wine-press tower, and then any other tower.



frequent intercommunion with her Son. He had seen him in glory upon the Mount, and might easily be inspired to remind her with fervent eloquence or brief ejaculation, as seemed best to the divine Spirit, of the design of that vision. He had seen Jesus himself as desolate, or more desolate, in his agony<sup>1</sup>. The sight of that countenance, when he rejoined the wearied Apostles, was still fresh in his memory. Hence he could suggest from the fact of the Transfiguration, at which Mary was not present, a confirmation of the belief, that Jesus would rise again, even in spite of his extreme degradation. This might have been done, not because Mary was ignorant of these things any more than Jesus, but because by a voluntary abasement on her part also, she chose to need and accept the office of a created nature to bring before her that, which she might have had directly from the inspiration of the Almighty. It would indeed be degrading to our Lady to suppose she was *obliged*<sup>r</sup> to look out of herself for comfort by any other compulsion than by that of her own pure will, which dictated to her the desire of being made as like to Christ as possible. But it tends rather to her honour and glory to acknowledge, that she willingly submitted to the faintness and bewilderment and need of support which her Son felt, in order to be as like him as possible, and to suffer all she could for us men and for our salvation. Martyrs when about to suffer have sometimes expressed satisfaction in laying

<sup>1</sup> It is worth observing, that when Satan appeared to St. Martin as Christ, he asked to see the wounds in his hands, and so frayed Satan away. As Jesus knew St. John was to see him in his agony, he took care beforehand to identify himself, by shewing himself to St. John, and the others who then saw him, in glory first.

<sup>r</sup> See vol. i. p. 326. n. f.



down their life\* for their flock, not because they thought they could do it without grace, but because they gratefully exulted in the grace which enabled them to be in this like our Lord. And Mary too might have exulted in the fact, that she was able to lay aside not the life of the body, but what was much more, the life of the soul: to strip herself of all inward consolation, and to abandon herself, though without the least consent to them, to temptations, to fear, to doubt, and to despair. God had suffered the devil to carry him to the temple, and set him on a pinnacle of it: why should not Mary suffer him to exalt her to the highest glory by temptations, which he wished might degrade her? Then he had quoted the promise of angel-guardians to the Just: now he found at hand one enabled by God to act the part of an angel-guardian to the blessed Virgin—St. John.

14. The power St. John had to do this might have come from the worthy reception of the Sacrament of Ordination, or from some miraculous grace infused into the beloved disciple at his first communion. It will be useful, in order to give this latter suggestion due weight, to quote two passages from two great doctors of the Incarnation, to shew the durable efficacy which they ascribed to that Sacrament. ‘Judas,’ says St. Cyril, ‘immediately after the morsel, Satan compels at once, as having got him under his power, to proceed to this most unholy treachery, fearing as is probable not his repentance only, but also the might of the Sacrament, lest by any means kindling in the man’s heart like light again, it should persuade him to take up again with doing right, or

\* Asseman. Acta Mart. Orient. saints having a kindred feeling  
i. p. 18, 22. where instances of occur.

engender even in him, who was persuaded fully to betray, a wholesome determination<sup>†</sup>." Thus he says, sifting Satan's thoughts as wheat. And St. Leo not otherwise, but even more eloquently, observes : ' You ought to have waited, Judas, for the consummation of your crime, and have put off the disgraceful death by the halter, till the Blood of Christ had been shed for all sinners. Then, when so many miracles of the Lord, so many gifts, were torturing your conscience, at all events you would have been called back from your precipice by those Sacraments, which, when detected in your perfidy by the signal divine knowledge furnished, you had received at the paschal supper. What made you diffident of his goodness, who had not repelled you from the communion of his Body and Blood ? who, when you came with a multitude and a troop of armed men to seize him, denied not to you the kiss of peace<sup>‡</sup> ? ' Here we see these two great Fathers represent the might of the Blessed Sacrament, as being the dread of Satan, and as having a power to convert, long after, even Judas himself. Judas was probably hanging dead at the time that Jesus was dying on the Cross : and Mary, who saw in him a type of all those who irreverently or sacrilegiously treat so great a Sacrament, would have in St. John, who drew from it strength and love, a source of comfort. Had he held his peace like the friends of Job, when first they came to him, still the very presence of such a saint would itself be to her a well-spring of consolation, if at any time she chose to stop in the midst of her ocean of desolation, and drink the stream of that comfort, which (like the fresh water springs said to be found in some parts of the sea) her Son had provided for her in St. John.

<sup>†</sup> In Joan. p. 743. d.

<sup>‡</sup> Leo, Serm. liv. §. 3.

15. But it may be said, that if our Lady had been so long under the Cross, she must have gained some drops of that sacred Blood upon her clothes, which, being one with God, was enough to solace her : and therefore the ministry of St. John was unnecessary. This, however, is easily retorted : for when her soul was desolate, it was in that special state in which succour from the Creator himself was purposely become unacceptable : she had consented to be put in that particular kind of desolation, which needs aid from creatures authorized by God to give it. As Christ in this state needed the Angel, so Mary needed St. John. Moreover, the Blood of Christ would, in her desolation, only suggest to her the sacrilegious use which Judas and his followers made of it, or the fact, that it was actually at the time being trampled under foot in the dust by Pagans and Jews. Hence, in that dark hour, when the destroying Angel seemed not to respect the Blood of the Lamb of God himself, it was meet for God, through the Blood St. John had received, to minister comfort to Mary, and thus afford her a present specimen of its power. Nor could it be wrong to suppose, that the veil of Mary on which that Blood had fallen, required sacerdotal hands to lift it off. Mary may with a sorrowful look have bid St. John, as a priest, remove it, have reminded him, that as her Son was a little lower than the Angels, so she was below him in respect of his priesthood, and thus have been the first who taught devotion to the Sacred Blood. If, as some have thought, St. John became the private chaplain of the Blessed Virgin, then we shall see the meaning of his words, ‘ From that hour that disciple took her to his own home ;’ words which in their natural sense imply, that a lasting arrangement of some kind

commenced in consequence of our Saviour's gracious words to St. John upon the Cross.

16. O that our souls could enter into the heart of St. John, and from that throne of purity and love, behold the deep abyss of Mary's pains of childbirth! As this may not be, these poor imaginations may help us to gaze as through a thick mist at the reality, and to learn concerning Mary and John what Scripture teaches also: "Forget not the groanings of thy Mother, remember that thou hadst not been born but through them, and make a return to them as they have done to thee. With all thy soul fear the Lord, and reverence his priests\*." May he, who makes the faithful dependent upon creatures for his sacraments, and all men dependent upon their parents for their existence, vouchsafe to make those not among the faithful dependent upon Mary for a new life!

\* Ecclus. vii. 29. The following words of St. Peter Chrysologus, Serm. xlix. fin. are worth adding here: Nunquam contra pietatis ordinem Matrem Dominus extero commendasset ex cruce, si alios ipsa præter illum filios suscepisset. Sed Virgini

Virginem tradidit, ut inter tales cura sola Sacramenti, sola societas religionis haberetur: nec mundanæ solitudini discipulus tantus iste serviret. Sed prædicaturus virginitatis partum, *domi haberet*, unde hoc dubitantibus approbaret.



## CHAP. IX.

## THE RESURRECTION.

1. AMONG other things which Jesus said, when he knew that *his* hour was come, was this: "A woman when she is in labour hath sorrow, because *her* hour is come: but when she hath brought forth the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world." If all we have said in the last chapter give in any sense a faint and distant view of Mary's pains of childbirth, when she became the Mother of all living, then it is hard to conceive these words going through the lips of Jesus, without a thought of Mary. This same dignity her Son gave her an earnest of on Easter day, by raising himself up through the eternal Spirit. As in the second Psalm also is written, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Her Son had begun to exist as man in her womb before he was born, and his second Birth was his Resurrection, and by it God begot him to her again to begin a new life, continuing for ever. As far as Scripture goes, however, it represents Jesus here as behaving with a disrespect far greater, than when he separated himself from Mary at the twelfth Passover. For it says not a word of his appearing to her after his Resurrection any where. All from which we can conclude, even as much as any appearance to his Mother at all, is, that he who said, 'Honour thy father and thy mother,' must have honoured his Mother, as in other respects, so in this. If then we conclude from this principle that he visited her at all, we may fairly conclude



more, and assume that he visited her first of all. This is the conclusion we shall naturally come to, and the one which obstinately cleaves to the heart of most learned and pious Catholics, in spite of Scripture difficulties raised against it. Thus the profound contemplative St. Ignatius, who was used to visions and revelations of the Lord, without any hesitation whatever in this case as in that of Joseph of Arimathea, boldly states his conviction on the subject: "On the Resurrection of Christ, and his first appearance. First, the Lord appeared to his Mother, after his Resurrection: for Scripture says, he appeared to many; now although it does not expressly mention her by name, yet it leaves it open to us to take that for certain, presuming we have understanding: lest otherwise we should have reason to take to ourselves the text, 'Are you also yet without understanding?'" The holy father of the Jesuits does not indeed directly apply this quotation to the deniers of the first assertion made by himself, that Jesus appeared to Mary first of all, but to those who deny that he appeared at all to her. Still the divines of the Society<sup>a</sup> have spoken so strongly in favour of the first assertion, that it may perhaps be taken as an indirect proof, that the sense of the Society was in favour of understanding him to apply the text to that first assertion also. It is not uncommon to take it for granted, in sermons and other practical works, that the first appearance was granted to Mary. Somewhat therefore ought to be said here, upon what is so likely to meet the ear of an enquiring protestant.

<sup>a</sup> E. g. Suarez. in pt. 3 q. lv. fere sine controversia omnium  
art. iv. p. 544. Hæc sententia fidelium et doctorum animis in-  
adeo est per se credibilis ut sederit.

2. First it is right to state, that there is no distinct mention of this appearance to Mary in any known early writer, except Sedulius, and that is so distinct, that even Casaubon<sup>b</sup> allows the weight of it. He wrote about the time of St. Augustine. An earlier testimony to the same effect occurs in St. Ambrose, who says, that Mary first saw the Resurrection of the Lord, and believed; and that Mary Magdalene also saw, though yet doubting. But as St. Ambrose conceived there were two Mary Magdalenes, it was possible, though unlikely, that he meant another Mary here, which if so, would take off somewhat from the value of this testimony. The language of Paulinus, which has been quoted, is far too vague to build any such belief upon, and this text has been abandoned by later writers. But the chief objection is drawn from the assertion of St. Mark, that Jesus appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene, which seems at first sight to be an insuperable objection to the assertion of St. Ignatius and the other Catholic writers who have followed or preceded him. Nevertheless, as St. Ignatius was far too profoundly and accurately versed in meditation on the Gospels to have passed this over, it would be the most absurd prejudice to suppose, that there was not some mode of perfectly and clearly explaining this seeming inconsistency. As the method of reconciling the two accounts generally given is not altogether satisfactory, it will be right here to attempt one, not indeed altogether new, yet more adapted perhaps to the wants of those for whom this book is intended.

3. The words of St. Mark are capable of another interpretation from that which is put upon them by

<sup>b</sup> Exercit. Baron. ap. Trom- Nyssen. iii. p. 402.  
belli, iv. p. 249. See also

the English reader. They may mean, that he appeared for the first time to Mary Magdalene; implying, that he appeared to her a second time. That he did appear twice to her, is held by St Ignatius; once while she was alone by the sepulchre, and again when she and the other women who brought the spices were met by Jesus in the way. That these were two distinct appearances is admitted by Mr. Greswell<sup>c</sup>, who however puts the appearance to the women in the way much later than St. Ignatius does. Here then we see, that so far as the fact of two appearances to the Magdalene are concerned, a protestant critic of no mean learning and accuracy agrees with the great Saint. This being so, it is plain that the objection from St. Mark's statement is not irrefragable: he may have meant simply to assert, that this appearance was the first appearance to the Magdalene, or that appearance, the events of which were afterwards detailed at full length by St. John<sup>d</sup>. But St. Mark's words admit also of a third interpretation. He had just been speaking of the women who had come to the sepulchre, seen the angels, and been scared away from the sepulchre by the sight. He then proceeds to say; "But Jesus, having<sup>e</sup> risen early on the first day of the week, appeared first to Mary the Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." This might mean, first of the women of

<sup>c</sup> Harmonia, p. 397, and p. 402.

<sup>d</sup> John xx. 11—18.

<sup>e</sup> All the Greek Mss, which have this part of St. Mark, have the past tense, not surgen, 'rising:' the Latin 'propter egestatem linguæ,' cannot easily express past participles. Some few have *πρώτη* for *πρώτον*. None have *ὑστάτον* for *ὑστερον* in

v. 14. which I mention, lest any one should take the 'Novissime' of the Vulgate, as a proof that St. Mark meant to give the first and the last appearance. Mr. Greswell, p. 402. makes it the fifth, St. Ignatius the ninth, and neither *the* last appearance. Novissime then must mean, a very late appearance, not the latest.

whom he had been speaking. But the other interpretation which includes this, appears to me by far the most satisfactory. It seems at the very least to be sufficiently capable of being put upon the words, to shew that no certain argument against the assertion of St. Ignatius, and of many others, can be drawn from them. The same Holy Spirit who spoke by the Evangelist, speaks also by the Church: as he has chosen to leave many things in the Evangelists which are hard to reconcile with each other, if not impossible, with our present imperfect knowledge, so he may appear to contradict, when he speaks by the Church, what he has said when he speaks by the Evangelist. We cannot conclude therefore from apparent contradictions to real ones, even when we are unable to suggest any satisfactory explanation.

4. Next, let us suppose this explanation to be unsatisfactory, and see whether one wholly irrespective of the particular meaning of the Evangelist's words, but based upon his general object, will not shew that the statements of Scripture are no refutation of the common belief of Catholics. Now it is very possible that a man, having two series of events before him, and intending only to speak of one of them, should speak of the first in the series he was going to treat of as *the* first, as if it was the first absolutely, or as if he put the other series altogether out of consideration. A familiar instance will explain this. A person might say, 'The first time I saw Dr. A. B. I had symptoms of such and such a character, which I stated to him distinctly at the time.' Another person with a different object in view might say, 'The first time you saw Dr. A. B. you were one of the strongest men I ever knew, and had no ailment or complaint whatever.' In the first case



‘seeing’ means, seeing him in his professional character; in the second it means, seeing him in company, or any where. The idea of seeing him as a friend is wholly out of the first person’s mind at the time: he has a series of professional visits before him, and is considering how far a certain medical man has understood his case, and worked the cure he promised. Hence he speaks of the first of these visits, as if absolutely the first time he had ever seen the aforesaid physician. Now our Lord told us, that they that are in health *need* not a physician, but they that are ill. St. Mark may be speaking of the visits he made to persons ill with doubt and want of faith, and call that his first appearance, which was the first he made in his capacity of physician. Now if it can be proved, that there were other appearances unquestionably antecedent to this to the Magdalene, and unquestionably not made with a view to heal doubts and create belief, then Mary may have been favoured with one of these. If, moreover, it can be shewn, that the object of those recorded in Scripture was that here stated, and that those not recorded were not made with *that* object, then it will be plain, that the opinion of Catholic writers is perfectly tenable. These two points then shall be proved as distinctly as I am able to do so.

5. In the first place it is pretty clear, that our Saviour was ‘seen of Angels’ at the Resurrection. He was justified in the Spirit, and seen of Angels, and preached to the Gentiles, as we infer from St. Paul’s Epistle to St. Timothy<sup>1</sup>. If these very words do not directly teach, that the Angels saw him after he rose again for our justification, at all

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 16.



events the Gospel narrative makes it pretty certain, that the Angels saw him at the Resurrection. There is not much more or much less reason for his being seen of Angels at one time than at another: the same Angels who saw him in his agony, would have a kind of claim to see him in his glory. At this rate then he appeared to Angels before he appeared to St. Mary Magdalene. Angels did not doubt, or require proof, or even believe; for they *see* the face of God, and in it all things present, at the least. Yet our Saviour vouchsafed to be seen by them when he rose, as if thereby conferring upon them a certain experimental proof of his Resurrection, over and above their infused knowledge of it. St. Mark, who knew this very well, said nothing of his appearance to the Angels, and consequently cannot mean absolutely that the first appearance to any creature whatever was to Mary Magdalene, but must necessarily limit this first appearance to the first of the appearances made to human beings. The next thing to be settled is, whether there are any human beings which do not come into his calculation, when he speaks of this as the first appearance. Now there were certain saints who rose at the Crucifixion, and if these had seen him before, nobody would accuse St. Mark of inaccuracy, if he dropped these out of his calculation, because they were not to stay among men, or suitable for proving what they might possibly have seen with bodily eyes, and borne witness of to the spirits in prison. But witnesses were wanted for the earth, for Gentiles, for the world at large. The question then is, what sort of witnesses were best suited for this purpose; and it is certain that the doubting Thomas did more to confirm the faithful in after ages, than even the Magdalene or the other

ten Apostles. It seems, then, that the overcoming of doubts was the engine employed by God to attest his Resurrection, and that the appearances made to those who had no doubt, are eliminated from the series recorded by the Evangelists. Thus the Magdalene thinks Christ has been carried away, not that he has risen again<sup>h</sup>. The two who went to Emmaus have no faith in the women's account of the Resurrection<sup>i</sup>. Neither did the others believe the report of these two<sup>k</sup>. Even when they saw Jesus, they thought he was a spirit, and doubted even after they had felt him<sup>l</sup>. When St. John has recorded one of the latest appearances, he adds, that Jesus did many other miracles<sup>m</sup> (besides that of the draught of fishes) in the presence of his disciples; but says, 'these are written, that you may believe.' He did miracles after his Resurrection, that is, to convince men of his personal identity. After this he adds a more general expression, which refers to his whole life. 'There are also many other things in all, which Jesus did, &c.' which seems to shew, that the former expression belongs to the miracles done after the Resurrection. It would not be unscriptural then to say, that the object of the recorded series is, to furnish full proof to those who had doubted themselves, and to furnish a like proof to others from the

<sup>g</sup> Pope Hormisdas ap. Hard. ii. p. 1015. Non ergo ad improbandum discipulum *interposita* est dubitatio, sed quæsitæ posteritatis instructio. Anne aliud spectat quod se idem Dominus Cleophæ cum alio discipulo... inseruit, [quam]...ut *per eorum dubitationem* daret credendi futuris sæculis firmitatem. Pelag. iii. p. 427. of Saulus qui est Paulus. "Ut cunctis quibus

per illam fuerit prædicaturus ostenderet quia valde verum est Dei Evangelium, quod et *tanta duritia inclinata* prædicaret."

<sup>h</sup> John xx. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Luke xxiv. 22.

<sup>k</sup> Mark xvi. 13.

<sup>l</sup> Luke xxiv. 37, 41.

<sup>m</sup> Comp. Acts i. 3. where the

Syriac has ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ.

fact, that their doubts had been perfectly overcome. Hence St. Paul intimates to the Corinthian sceptics, that they might find eyewitnesses of the Resurrection who were not yet fallen asleep <sup>n</sup>.

6. This view of the matter will account for the fact, that, as far as the Scripture instances go, St. John himself is never honoured with a separate appearance. He says, with his usual modesty, ‘the disciple who had come first to the sepulchre *saw and believed*; for as yet *they* knew not the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead:’ as if he wished to appear as one of the other disciples, no better than they, and by this means to conceal his virtue. He then relates how, after they had gone, Magdalene waited till she saw Jesus for the first time, and told the disciples. It is plain then that St. John, who came fresh from Mary’s presence, is not to be included in the number of those who knew not the Scriptures. It is highly probable that it was in that disciple’s own home that Jesus first appeared to his Mother, and perhaps soon after to her son Saint John. Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus had buried him, as Lazarus had been done, in grave clothes wrapped round him, and with spices, keeping to the Jewish fashion, perhaps, in order to escape detection, and not because they thought he would not rise again°. For though Joseph was a disciple, and was expecting the kingdom of God, still he kept his discipleship secret for fear of the Jews: and the same may have been the case with Nicodemus also. It is not, however, mentioned, that Jesus appeared to these in private, though it is highly credible that he would do so. If then any one object that these,

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 6.

quo divitias requirebat. Aug.

° Sepeliebat pauperem, in Serm. xlv. §. 7.

or at least Nicodemus, must have doubted, to have brought spices to embalm Jesus, let it be remembered, that what is here contended for is, that all the appearances recorded in Scripture are made to people who doubted, and not that all appearances to people who doubted are recorded in Scripture. Therefore if Nicodemus or Joseph did doubt, they neither are recorded, nor need be recorded to make this statement good. But Mary, who for us men and for our salvation suffered, according to several great Fathers, the sword of doubt to pass through her soul, yet did not yield to the temptation, which she voluntarily and compassionately took upon her. What she suffered would have entitled her to see Jesus first, even had she not been his Mother. It seems then upon the whole, that there is nothing in Scripture to warrant any one calling the Catholic belief, concerning her having seen Jesus first, unscriptural. His visit to her was not, if the expression may be pardoned, a professional one, was not made as the physician of doubts, but as a Son, who knew that the application of the senses to so holy an object of love as himself would be grateful to her, who was a traveller heavenward still, even though she was meditating with a perfect faith upon the glory she knew would follow. Though he had not yet ascended to his Father, his Mother had a right to touch him, and to kiss his wounds, and to draw graces from them for those who doubted.

7. All the appearances recorded in Scripture could have been carried out in a day or two: forty days was an unnecessary expenditure of time upon them, so far as we can see, unless Jesus had some other object in view. In order to understand this, we naturally ask ourselves the question, what went of



Jesus when he was not appearing to his disciples and others? Why send them off to Galilee, when they were all together at Jerusalem? Mary and the love for Mary suggests a simple answer. When the Passover was finished, the regular thing was to go home; Mary therefore went to Nazareth, and Jesus naturally followed her. When he was not abroad teaching his disciples, he was at home. What can be more simple than this? Yet observe also how it confirms what we have said all along, which is, that Jesus was absolutely full of grace and truth at the first; that Mary kept increasing to the last: she never had been full of grace in such sense, that her Almighty Son could not enlarge her heart to hold more. So far then are we from confounding her privileges with the attributes of the Trinity, that we make her less even than the created humanity of our Lord. If we piously suppose Jesus at home when not with his disciples, we shall do so under the idea that he could still, even then, do something more for the Mother of all living, still enlarge those graces he had conferred upon her, and make them grow. He was now glorified in body, and could die no more: he was glorified in soul, and could be agonized no more. Still he could veil his glory, and appear like a gardener, or some ordinary person, whom St. Peter failed, till John taught him, to recognise for the Lord. He ate and drank with his glorified body after his resurrection, being still able to destroy the food he needed no more. Why should he be unable with his glorified soul to do acts of reverence to Mary: if the same sea of Galilee which twice before had felt his miraculous power, was again after his Resurrection to feel that he ruled it, when Peter drew a hundred and fifty-



three fishes from it at his command; why should not the cottage at Nazareth also see him again subject to Mary? Is it more wonderful for a glorified body to be able to eat of what he had caught by his supremacy over all creatures, than to be able to obey by his marvellous condescension one he had obeyed so long, would be to a glorified soul? These are questions which might indeed be answered at full here; but as it will be necessary to treat of the same subject again by and by, some suggestions which will give its difficulties a fuller and plainer statement are all which will be given in this part of the work.

8. The obedience he had shewn before to Mary did not come from fear, or any of those passions of the soul which the glorifying power of the Resurrection had obliterated, but from a deliberate judgment of the reason rather, which confided in her, to whom, as God, he had given so many graces. If he had feared her, his love for her would have been of an imperfect kind; for perfect love casts out fear, and therefore that obedience came from a durable quality of Christ's soul, and not from an accident of it. His obedience never depended upon the state of his body, but upon that of his soul, and if this was not altered in respect of those faculties which determined him to obey his Mother before his Resurrection, neither was it altered in regard to the determination itself. But without pushing our claims for Mary so far as to insist upon it without any authority whatever, that, if at Nazareth when not teaching he must have obeyed her; it is plain that he may have performed certain acts of reverential love towards her, and furnished her with a scope for

<sup>p</sup> Suarez. in q. lv. art. 3. recte dixit) prorsus incognita  
Est hæc res (ut D. Thomas hominibus, p. 543. l. b.

exerting her influence with him, in behalf of others. It seems, however, to be perfectly in harmony with what was before advanced, as the reason for his long delay at Nazareth before commencing his ministry, to assert, that his present delay on earth was occasioned not by the needs of the case viewed externally, but by love for Mary, by his design to give her immense power in his kingdom. When God does what is apparently strange and unaccountable, it is religious to endeavour to find a reason for it. Those who say Mary was a good woman only, cannot object to a reason drawn from the fact, that we are creatures of habit, and require time to learn to fit ourselves for the end for which God has created us. Nor can it be objected from Scripture that St. Luke says, our Lord was seen by his disciples for forty days: for all that the Greek or Latin implies is, that his appearances took place during forty days, and not that they took up the whole of every one of them. Certainly, all that are actually recorded would leave time enough upon our Saviour's hands for him to spend with his blessed Mother, to enlarge her powers for assisting us. The profuseness of his own pains leads us to expect a profuseness of gifts to her who had shared them.

9. Let us consider then how he could have occupied his time with his Mother, and we shall see that she must have received fresh graces at his hands. In the first place, he would have given her a special opportunity of praying to him. This is very easy for a Catholic to believe, seeing he knows it is better to pray in the presence of the blessed Sacrament than elsewhere. But a reflecting protestant must see, that if one place where Jesus is, is as good to pray in as another where he is not, then the Incarnation

was of no use, and the flesh of Christ, which is limited to space, is not a special channel of grace which could have been given without it. Proximity then to the Flesh of Jesus was a special opportunity for *obtaining* graces. And if for obtaining on Mary's part, then for granting upon Christ's part, for 'mercy is twice blest' in creatures here below, 'it blesses him that gives, and him that takes.' Hence, if Mary earned it for us, she earned it for herself: the very act of praying for us in Christ's presence, was such an approach to the source of all merit, as must have earned merit here, and the reward of justice<sup>a</sup> hereafter. Suppose her to have as perfect a motherly love to us as you please, still that perfection was only relative, not absolute. She was not God as her Son was, and therefore admitted of being continually enlarged in love by doing acts of it, and of these acts she was capable at all events, if she was only a good woman as our adversaries assert. It seems then highly probable, that if Jesus had made his Mother no greater than this, he would not after his Resurrection have failed to see her, and give her opportunities of worshipping him and praying to him. This we may conclude by bringing the light of nature to bear upon revealed facts.

10. Next, it has been supposed that Mary had a habit of influencing Jesus authoritatively, which would remain in her even after death. If this be so, it is obvious to see that the prayers of Mary, directed even to her glorified Son, would be wholly and entirely distinct from that of any other saint or Angel. For to which of the saints or Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Mother? He had taken in

<sup>a</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 8. ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ of justice.  
τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, the crown

his human nature a capacity for being a little lower than Angels, and for reverencing the memories of the saints, yet that reverence being done by a human nature in perfect union with the Divine Essence, was absolutely perfect in its kind. He had taken also a capacity for being subject to his parents. If his human nature enabled Mary to command him, his divine enabled her to pray to him: the oneness of his Person prevented her commanding without respect, or praying without authority. She had given him the nature over which she bore sway as a Mother, but it was in so perfect union with the divine nature, that she could hardly sever reverence for the Person from her acts of authority, or authority from her acts of reverence. She acquired an indirect authority with the divine nature of her Son, through the human nature which she had furnished to it. This authority she had exercised so often, that it must have left a habit in her; as Jesus's submission must have left a habit in him. The circumstances of both were changed, yet a habit of some kind must have remained from thirty years' mutual relationship as Mother and Son, in either of them. This habit would issue in acts so far as circumstances permitted.

11. The thing which is without any parallel in any other being, may yet admit of the following illustration. St. Monica prayed for nine years long for her son's conversion: at last she obtained it, and became his mother after the spirit as well as after the flesh. Nobody would say St. Monica was as great a saint as St. Augustine: nevertheless, he owed her a debt of gratitude which he felt habitually—which feeling was a habit to him. We may conceive this habit to exist even in a future state even in heaven, we may



conceive St. Austin to look with a respectfulness to his mother, which would make him willing to pray for any thing for which she prayed, with a willingness resulting from that gratitude. He owes his life natural and supernatural to her : a sense of justice would be enough to make him pay attention to her requests, even if we could suppose charity to leave heaven for a while<sup>r</sup>. Of course, this is in no sort an exact counterpart to the case of Jesus and Mary : still it is a help towards conceiving that intermixture of authority which the prayer of a Mother must carry with it even in Mary's case. This is what I have called authoritative influence with Jesus. As Augustine is a greater saint than Monica, yet has a sort of reverence for her wishes even now ; so Jesus, though greater than Mary, may yet continue to have dutiful attentiveness to her prayers. Of course, the difference between Augustine and his mother is a finite one, the difference between God and his Mother an infinite one. Still the difference between the saints is a step on which we may stand to get an easier glimpse of God and the Queen of Saints ; the relationship of these may be in some measure conceived through the instrumentality of the relationship of the former.

12. Now without settling here the question whether such reverence on our Lord's part could be called *Dulia*, it is plain that this sort of authoritative influence, based in gratitude, so to speak, and hemmed in by intense charity, is wholly and utterly distinct from the domineering supremacy over Jesus, which ignorant protestants imagine that Catholics ascribe to Mary. Thus, we may imagine Jesus after he had risen performing some menial act in Mary's house,

<sup>r</sup> Aristot. E. N. viii. 1. φίλων μὲν ὄντων, οὐδὲν δεῖ δικαιοσύνης.



to remind her of this authoritative influence over himself. It is no matter if no such thing ever actually took place, so long as imagining it serves to hold a certain doctrine before our minds. For if our risen Lord ate and drank with his disciples, it would be no greater condescension to do some menial act for his Mother ; such an act might or might not be done with the intention of Dulia. At any rate, it is easier to bring before us the fact of her continued influence with him, by means of imagining things upon earth, than by means of imagining things in heaven. If then this seems to Catholic readers a clumsy and unauthorized way of bringing before aliens the immense power of Mary's prayers, and the clean and hard marked distinction between her and the Saints and Angels, let them not reject the scaffolding till the building is secured.

13. Whether Mary assisted at the function which must have taken place when Jesus appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, whether our Lord introduced her to the Christians then forming, and commended them to her care, I will leave to the meditation of the pious. In like manner, her presence at the Ascension cannot be proved, and need not here be discussed\*. Her presence at Pentecost is absolutely certain, and is worth noticing here, because it seems to shew, that at that period her gifts, though supposed to be of all kinds, were capable of being increased in quantity. Of her daily reception of the most holy Sacrament at the hands of St. John, sufficient intimations have already been given to furnish

\* It may be observed, that St. Lewis, when asked to assist at a miraculous display of our Lord's power in the Eucharist,

refused, on the ground that it would not make his faith in the Real Presence stronger than it was.

materials for contemplation. These are not matters so much for those out of the Church to weigh, as for those in it: nor are they particularly likely to constitute difficulties such as would hinder the former on their journey to that one Fold, under one God the Father of us all, and one Mother the Mother of all living.

14. Enough has been said here to shew what was wanted: namely, that if Mary was a good woman, her command over the fountain of all graces Jesus Christ, was such as to have enabled her to raise herself to a dignity infinitely greater than any thing we can conceive, even while her Son was on earth. Enough has also been done to shew reasonable minds, that we do not confuse Mary with God, or raise her to the dignity of a fourth person in the Trinity, if such an expression be admissible. At the same time it must be owned, that nothing will satisfy captious minds who dote upon words, and fancy when they have found an expression they can put their own meaning upon, that they have detected Catholics in a lie, and that after all they do make our blessed Lady a goddess. To prevent any such uncharitable persons thinking I wish to escape their censures, I will boldly confess if they please, that Mary is to me now more than God was to me when a protestant. So bright is the light of God's presence in the Church, that it gives even to a darkened soul more exalted notions of a creature in it, than of the Creator out of it. This of course is a statement which can by no possibility be true of all God's attributes, as, for instance, of his creatorship or his avenging justice. Still it may be useful to have made it, in order to lead the persons just mentioned not to force words into a sense in which none but a madman could use them;

useful too to lead them to reflect, by the aid of the materials now furnished them, in what respects the Creator can be contrasted with his creature, and how the greatness of his incommunicable attributes can be brought out by the majesty of those he is able to communicate.

## CHAP. X.

## PROTESTANT OBJECTIONS TO THE FOREGOING DOCTRINE.

1. WHAT has hitherto been done in this part of the work is nothing more than an attempt to apply the doctrine, laid down in the first part, to the actual life of Jesus at Nazareth. It is an attempt to force upon those out of the Church (it may be said) the conclusions of those who are in it. Little, it may be urged, has been said of the difficulties in the way of coming to such a conclusion; and the thing has been argued throughout as a matter of consistency, without at all considering whether other Christians have felt themselves influenced by a sense of consistency to adopt the same conclusions; whether, in fact, it is so sure, that all this is consistent with the Christianity of other days. Now persons may perhaps exist who feel, that matters of faith are too serious to be left to the mere test of consistency; that other people may see things in another light, and one detect inconsistencies, where another saw nothing of the kind; that definite and express statements of the Church or the Bible are wanted, before they can take up even with what does seem consistent with what they really believe; that as they have no such proof that the Church, in their idea of the Church, that is the Church of the first ages, held any thing of the kind, so they have what they think very sufficient proof that she did not hold such notions of the Virgin Mary as Roman Catholics now hold.

Hence they think, that, so far as the Virgin goes, they are bound to stand aloof from the Roman Church; they will not canonize God's Mother, so long as there are so many objections in the way of doing so.

2. To this we will reply, that your dislike to do so shall be now made the most of: and with a view to make the most of it, it shall be put here under the special patronage of the Church's own example. We want you who do not canonize Mary, to do so. Now what does the Church do before she canonizes one hitherto not canonized? It would require a volume to describe the whole process, the congregations concerned, their mode of sifting evidence, the kind of witnesses examined, the business of every official. But there is one official, whom, in Homeric phrase, the gods call, Promoter of the Faith; but men, the Devil's Advocate. His business is, to get together all plausible objections against the canonization, in order that the Church may come to a more secure conclusion. This is the way the Church deals with the cause of supposed saints before sundry congregations of Catholic dignitaries: we are pleading the cause not of a saint, but of the Queen of all saints; not before an assembly of Catholic prelates, but before a protestant public; not before people prepossessed in favour of sanctity, but before people with the strongest prepossessions against its three principal phases, poverty, chastity, and obedience. It is but fair that a chapter should be set apart for the performance of the Devil's advocate's part, and accordingly this chapter shall be devoted to it.

3. Before entering upon this undesirable office, it will be as well to say what sort of objections are, and what are not, included in this chapter. It is



quite obvious, that there are people in the world who are fond of an argument, and are mighty little concerned with the eternal welfare of their own soul. Now as this book has not a theoretical object in view, but a practical one, persons of this sort need not complain if their ingenuities have not been anticipated here. The devils in hell could doubtless have found subtle objections against the ablest work of St. Thomas, St. Athanasius, or St. Augustine. But this book commenced with stating, that the question, whether Mary is to be worshipped or not, is a practical question: a man's soul *may* be staked upon the answer he gives to it\*. Therefore this work has not time to stop and fight out every objection: and even when it professes to state plausible ones, it only means such as seem to the writer likely to appear plausible to men in earnest. Of course no one individual can get hold of all objections even of this kind.

4. Moreover, the law of the Gospel, 'he that believeth not shall be damned,' is very explicit. But persons out of the Church certainly have no means of testing, whether their own belief in particular is enough to secure them in particular from being damned. Till you have a certain rule to go by, it is quite fair to say to you; secure being saved by believing to the degree of believing too much, (as it will seem to you,) rather than risk being damned by not believing enough. Now, as you must know, it is nonsense to pretend that Catholics confuse Jesus and Mary; as you must know, that they constantly say, Mary, pray for us, and never say, Jesus, pray for us, (not to repeat what has been said in the Introduction;) secure believing enough then, by

\* Vol. i. p. 4.

believing in Mary's power. By believing enough, I do not mean here, believing a sufficient number of doctrines, but believing with sufficient intensity. You have seen already in this book, that if you *could* believe in Mary's power, you would have what may be called a graphic way of keeping the doctrine of the Incarnation upon the retina of faith's eye. Why then cut yourself off from this, unless you are sure it is necessary for your orthodoxy to do so?

5. This might lead me to observe, that objections, the answers to which were already furnished in this book, need not be stated here. 'Men and brethren,' I may say, 'touching the Incarnation of God the Son, I am this day called in question.' If I said so, it would mean, touching the Incarnation, and what naturally follows from it. When St. Paul said, 'touching the Resurrection of the dead, I am this day called in question,' *he* did not mean that the belief, as the Jews viewed it, was the crime for which he was tried, but this belief as he viewed it himself, in its consequences, taken along with the fact, that God had taken flesh and could not be holden down by death, or come to such corruption as preceded that Resurrection in which the Pharisees believed. Here then we are in the same sense called in question about the Incarnation and those consecrations of it, which we suppose all earnest Christians must be capable of seeing, when put before them.

6. The objections here stated, then, will not include those likely to be made by persons not earnest Christians, that is, Christians not trying to live up to what they do believe. Now it is a doctrine of natural religion, that God cannot err, nor lead into error. If God could err, he could not be a guide to the blind: if he would lead into error those

that diligently seek him, he would not be such a guide. Let this then be the test to each man, whether he is an earnest Christian or not: *let him pray to God to know how much HE wishes his Mother to be honoured.* The man who will not do this, either distrusts Almighty God, or his own present creed. If he prays earnestly for light upon a point, it is impossible God should refuse him light. Suppose a Catholic was tempted to doubt, if protestantism was not true: would a protestant acquit him of sin, if he did not pray to get light from God on the subject? Certainly, he would not: neither should we, because we are absolutely certain that God would lead no one into error. If indeed you say, 'I am not tempted to doubt if Mariolatry is right, for I am sure it is wrong;' then we should argue in another manner with you, according to your knowledge or condition. For if you are not tempted to doubt, whether what all Catholics hold may not be true, we see not how you exempt yourself from conceit, or God from a lie. God promised to be with Christians always to the end of the world; but you say he has left the larger number of Christians, and come to you only. O happy you! give me the proof of his Real Presence among you! shew me the greater things than he did, which you have done! shew me your sons and your daughters that see visions! give me the evidence of miracles and prophecies in your favour! and I will blaspheme the Virgin Mary!

7. Let thus much suffice to shew the kind of objections it has been wished to pass over here. Of those actually stated, some will not be answered: a foot note, pointing out where to find the answer to them, is all that will be given. Nevertheless, it

seemed as well to put them in, to 'stuff out' the mass of objections, and make it big with its own importance. For although I have long tried to put together things which seemed to me of any real weight, I frankly own I am disappointed that I can bring forward so little, and should be obliged to any thoughtful protestant who would send me such objections as he could face upon his knees before his God, and continue really to think of weight. Only let him beware of filling his mouth with arguments against non-entities; or sending things for refutation, which have been unsparingly scourged already by Catholic divines. For as for objections really *felt*, persons may be found somewhere in the Church to answer solidly any argument, which a man in earnest about his soul can advance.

8. The objections which are here stated fall naturally under two heads, those drawn from Scripture, and those drawn from tradition. And it shall be endeavoured to give them all the force possible to give them, under the impression that if any one or more of them is positively and entirely unanswerable, that is all the better<sup>b</sup>. It forces us to look at the matter honestly, as moral accountable beings, and to expect difficulties in the way of belief, and to hold with the firm grasp of faith to the overwhelming mass of evidence in favour of the worship of Mary, in spite of some half dozen uncomfortable objections. To proceed then with the undesirable office which this chapter undertakes to execute.

9. I. "The little that Scripture says<sup>c</sup> about the blessed Virgin, is in itself enough to throw the strongest suspicion of novelty and of opposition to the revealed word upon the principles and practices

<sup>b</sup> Chap. xi. §. 3. xii. §. 17.

<sup>c</sup> Chap. xi. §. 5.



of modern Rome. An immense prominence is given by that Church to what Scripture says hardly any thing about: in Scripture Mary is a modest retiring Virgin, in the Church of Rome a busy interfering Matron<sup>d</sup>. Scripture represents her as a good woman indeed, yet as one that knew her place, and never put herself forward, or if she did, as getting reprimanded for it by her Son, as soon as he had once entered upon his Ministry. The Apostles in preaching never recommend devotion to her, or put her forward in any way in their writings, although, to say the least, the chances are that she was dead, and gone before some of the Epistles were written<sup>e</sup>. Neither again is there in the Old Testament that clear and continuous chain of types and prophecies in regard to Mary, which there are in regard to our Saviour; and yet if the Spirit of the Prophets had foreseen and contemplated such a Christianity as Rome puts forward, they must have given her a prominent place, and one that held some kind of proportion to the place assigned to our Lord<sup>f</sup>. In fact, I have little doubt but that if a Papist were ordered to write Gospels or Prophecies, he would reconstruct them upon an entirely different model to that which God has chosen, and have put his favourite object of worship far more prominently forward. ‘Undue importance’ would have ‘been attached’ to the creature. Scripture then is protestant, not catholic, upon this point.”

10. II. Another class of objectors may be supposed to argue at much greater length somewhat as follows: “Though I am no admirer of those ultra views of tradition, which give it place in their esteem co-

<sup>d</sup> Chap. xi. §. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. §. 8. and chap. xiii.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. §. 13.



ordinate with that which Scripture holds: still, as I am obliged to go by the Catholic Church for my knowledge of what is Scripture and what is not, it seems absurd to say that she is to be the judge of this, but not to be the judge of what doctrine it contains. For how can she judge what is God's work, if she cannot say what doctrine it befits him to teach? But I am not at all prepared to admit that the Church of Rome is *the* Church, and I go by antiquity as the safest guide. Taking this for my guide, I find in the Romish Church great corruptions and deviations from the teaching and spirit of the early Church: and among these corruptions, none is greater than the extravagant honours she pays to the Virgin. And I shall proceed to throw together my reasons for thinking so, which, if viewed as a whole, I think quite unanswerable<sup>g</sup>."

11. "In the first place then, the negative argument against the present Romish views is very strong indeed. Its nature and weight may be made to appear conveniently by the following statement. If we take any set of sermons of the five first centuries, or even later on, and any set of commentaries of about that period, we shall find a number of opportunities for descanting upon the Virgin completely thrown away by the Fathers, but which we may be pretty sure a Romanist would have used<sup>h</sup>. Neither is this a mere gratuitous assumption, because it so happens that there are books which throw the ancients and the moderns so into juxtaposition, that we can see the thing here meant with our eyes. Thus Francis Combefis, a learned and elegant scholar, has published a large collection of sermons from divines of all ages, down to the time of St. Bernard.

<sup>g</sup> Chap. xi. §. 14.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. §. 20. &c.

The early sermons, when *genuine*, be it observed, are very free from Mariolatry: the later and the spurious sermons become more and more infected with it, as time went on. So again, Michael Ghisler, another learned man, published a bulky commentary on Jeremiah, which gives a fine opportunity for observing the same phenomenon in regard to the ancient commentators, as has just been noticed in regard to the early preachers."

12. "In this manner these two learned Catholics unintentionally shew up the novelties of their own Church. Now supposing it to be true that Mariolatry was useful in the affair of our salvation, how comes it that the ancient doctors are so careless about their flock, as to preach to them Jesus and the Resurrection, but not Mary and the Assumption? If they were not Mariolaters, where was the Church then? You find fault with me for supposing Christ's promise failed for a certain number of centuries: what became of it in those centuries, when it was not idolatrous, not Romish, not such as you would have it to be? How comes it, when the Church of Rome wants to cajole her priests into a belief that she was always the same, she treats them in her breviary to spurious sermons<sup>i</sup>, with the revered names of Chrysostome or Augustine prefixed to them, that the doctrine may seem to be ancient? Chrysostome, to be sure, is Mariolater enough, when you trust to Metaphrastes of the tenth century to give you his genuine productions; and Augustine or Ephrem<sup>k</sup>, when not as yet subjected to the uncompromising criticism of the hardy Gallicans of St. Maur, may prove admirable vouchers for the early existence of Mariolatry."

<sup>i</sup> Chap. xii. §. 3. &c.

<sup>k</sup> p. 170. n. q.

13. "Such negative evidence is often, I am perfectly aware, coolly set aside by Romanist controversialists as of no weight whatever in the matter—as if forsooth, because it is hard to prove a negative in demonstrative matter, therefore proofs of a negative character were of no weight in probable matter—as if this difficulty, of such importance to attend to in physical science, constituted a rule equally applicable to moral matters. But that it is of weight may be seen from the fact, that no sober critic now-a-days would rest his argument for the Trinity upon the controverted text in St. John's first Epistle<sup>1</sup>; and that mainly because the negative argument against that text is so strong, as to be in itself unanswerable with our existing knowledge. But the weight of negative evidence in this case is greatly increased by considering, that even when ancient authors do make approaches to modern doctrine, and upon kindred subjects too, still they keep aloof of the Virgin<sup>m</sup>. An instance or two will put this before you."

14. "Thus Chrysostome, even when he does not come from Metaphrastes, has some injudicious passages about the power of the Apostles and Martyrs, so strong that you might be apt to buoy yourself up with the hope that he at least would keep a civil tongue in his head, when upon the subject of the darling object of modern Rome's veneration; and in vain will you call him a scholar of Diodore of Tarsus, and opponent of allegorical interpretation, or an over violent orator, for he is a doctor in your own Church. He, however, has the following passages palatable enough to a protestant, but possibly not so palatable to the devotee of Mary<sup>n</sup>. 'What she undertook when

<sup>1</sup> 1 John v. 7.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xii. §. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Chap. xi. §. 16.

she came to see Christ, was a piece of *excessive* ambition, for she wanted to shew off to the people, how she was the mistress and in authority over the Lad, having hitherto *no idea* of any thing great about him. And this is the reason also why she came to him at an unseasonable time.' And as the reason why she had an Angel sent to her to announce the Incarnation, he gives the following: 'It was that she might not be in a flurry and a great fright: for it was like enough, that if she had no clear idea on the matter, she might think of doing something out of the way with herself, and be for hanging or stabbing herself, as not able to bear the disgrace.' Whether or no this great preacher would be patient of modern development is for you to decide: but I cannot say that he seems to me to be ambitious of it, nor do I think that an Italian congregation would have complimented him on his sermon, even if they were content with this negative disapprobation."

15. "Again, what is better known than that St. Leo was a great doctor of the Incarnation, and that he descants in most extravagant terms upon the power of St. Peter and St. Paul, the duty of having special patrons, and the power of St. Peter over all the Church in any thing and every thing<sup>p</sup>? Yet he does not say a syllable about the duty or advantage of asking for the Virgin's intercession: St. Peter holds with him the place of the modern queen of heaven. Neither can you say then, that he was afraid of such devotion being perverted; for he has no fear of men saying, 'we offer sacrifice to thee, Peter, or to thee, Paul<sup>q</sup>,' which the Council of Trent

<sup>o</sup> ap. Petav. de Inc. xiv. 1. §. 4.

<sup>p</sup> See vol. i. p. 404. s. and chap. xi. §. 16. xii. 20, 21.

<sup>q</sup> Sess. xxii. cap. 3. These words are taken from St. Austin, see below, p. 154. n. o.

seems to think the consummation of perversion in such matters. Pius the Ninth would have said of Mary, what Leo says of Peter."

16. "Moreover, when the Pseudo-Dionysius concocted his celestial hierarchy in the sixth century, in spite of his undisguised dislike of Nestorianism, he has not found a place for the Virgin either in his celestial or terrestrial Hierarchy. In his treatise on the Names of God, he has, *in a parenthesis*, mention of some story about the apostles coming to the sight of the life-beginning and god-receiving body; in which later writers have found a clear account of the Assumption<sup>r</sup>. Maximus<sup>s</sup>, in his scholion on the place, only ventures to say, that *perhaps* this is meant of the Assumption. Neither he nor any other theologians of his day find any fault with the Pseudo-Dionysius for not putting her forward. Now this is a pretty plain proof, that they did not miss her as a modern Romanist would do, if her throne were left vacant<sup>t</sup>. Moreover, if Dionysius had not been a clumsy hand at aping the style and matter of the first century, you might have said he left out the Virgin, because she was perhaps alive at the time he pretends to be writing in: but as he was a clumsy hand at doing so, it shews he thought there was no such feeling towards her in early days."

<sup>r</sup> Vol. i. p. 539. Some suggest *σήματος* for *σώματος*, which appears to me to make better sense: they would not have been said to come to the *sight*, but to the burial of a body rather. A good collation of the Mss. of this impostor might set this and other kindred questions at rest. It should be said, however, that he speaks, at p. 55. in true Mono-

physite style, 'of the *god*-beginning mystery of the unutterable godification' (*θεοπλαστίας*) taking place in Mary. But English cannot do his pomposity justice: to a person acquainted with good Greek merely, and not with theology, it would be ludicrous, and almost comical.

<sup>s</sup> Chap. xii. §. 18. Le Quien. Diss. Dam. ii. p. xxxviii-ix.

<sup>t</sup> Chap. xii. §. 4.



17. "Another species of negative argument is to be found in this: St. Augustine when discussing the question, How, if perfect justice was possible for a mortal, no mortal had ever actually attained it? meets the question, and that not once only, but several times on other grounds, but does not adduce the Virgin as a modern Romanist would have done, as an instance of an actually existing example of perfection. Again and again does he speak of Christ as the only perfect specimen of humanity<sup>x</sup>. On the contrary, when Paulinus writes to him as follows, he does not meet with any reproof from St. Augustine; and Paulinus, be it remembered, was a devout worshipper of the saints; 'When she saw Christ dead, through human infirmity, she wept for him, and took him to bury him, without at all presuming upon his resurrection; because the punishment of the Passion, set before her eyes, blinded her belief in the wonder that was to follow: though the Lord had consoled her<sup>y</sup>.'"

18. "Nor is this the language of the West only, nor in accordance with St. Chrysostom only, but even of one who was a stern enemy of his. For what will you make of the doctor of the Incarnation himself, the very man upon whom you have leant

<sup>u</sup> De Pec. Mer. ii. §. 7. de Perf. Justit. de Sp. et lit. §. 62. de Nat. et Grat. §. 49. Epist. 157. §. 4. 177. §. 16.

<sup>x</sup> An answer to this will be found in part iii. where the words, 'Nullam habere volo quæstionem,' are explained.

<sup>y</sup> Ap. Aug. Ep. 121. The whole question is, whether this 'desolation' (see Paulinus, §. 18.) was, or was not, super-

natural and voluntary: if it was, the answer to this and the next objection is supplied above, chap. vi. §. 18. and viii. §. 12. Sacchinus ad Paulin. Ep. l. fin. has the same explanation. But it may be added, that, in his reply, St. A. talks of *discipulorum* infirmitas, but avoids Paulinus's language, and was moreover 'in a great hurry' to save the post. Ep. 149. §. 33.

so much? What will you say, when even the Egyptian<sup>a</sup> himself proved a broken reed? How can you possibly elude the force of the following unmistakeable passages? ‘The Passion, which happened *unexpectedly*, scandalized even the very Mother of the Lord herself; and the exceeding bitter death upon the Cross, did all but cause her to be out of her sober senses.’ Again: ‘It is no such wonder, if she fell into this, being a woman. For if Peter, the chiefest of the holy disciples, was scandalized once . . . when he said, ‘That be far from you, Lord,’ is it any marvel if the soft spirit of a woman got hurried off into notions of this faltering kind<sup>a</sup>?’ Sure (to use your great doctor’s words of Christ’s own flesh<sup>b</sup>) it would have been no hard thing for the Omnipotent Word of God to have removed this doubt from his own Mother, if she held the place in the economy of our Redemption, which you Catholics assign to her. Indeed so clearly does this passage tell against you, that Sixtus Senensis is wise enough to omit it altogether; and Petavius<sup>c</sup> intimates, that it is licentious, impious, and intolerable language<sup>d</sup>.”

19. “Moreover, the learned Bingham assures us, that in the ancient Liturgies, under the names of St. Basil, Chrysostome, Gregory Nazianzen, and

<sup>a</sup> A slang name for St. Cyril, with Theodoret and other Nestorians.—See ch. xii. §. 20.

<sup>a</sup> See part i. chap. xiii. 11. and part ii. chap. iv. §. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Page 1067. a.

<sup>c</sup> Petav. l. c. xiv. 1. §. 5.

<sup>d</sup> The visions of sister Emeric everywhere give the same naturalness to our Lord’s Mother. In speaking of St. Chrysostom in the next chapter, some additional remarks

touching St. Cyril will occur. Meantime let it be observed, that if the supernatural gifts claimed for our Lady in the third part are conceded to her, that sovereign mastery over her passions and affections claimed for her above, chap. vii. §. 7. becomes infinitely *more* credible. Neither St. Cyril nor St. Paulinus say worse of our Lady, than St. Paul of our Lord, in Heb. v. 7.

Cyril, they prayed for all the saints, the Virgin Mary herself not excepted°. Now if these Liturgies were of the date they claim to be, they prove what was thought of the Virgin by their authority: if the forgeries of later times, they prove that the same opinion existed, and was continued on even to a later period. And you Romanists are continually urging these prayers to prove the belief in purgatory always existed: but purgatory is a place for sinners: therefore, in those days, the Virgin was held to be a sinner: therefore she is as wisely left out of the celestial Hierarchy by Dionysius, as she is unwisely put at the head of it by yourselves. Add to this, that the tradition of single Fathers may be got over: it may be, that the author is expressing a private opinion: but the tradition of a liturgy is a public opinion, and implies the preexistence of a feeling in the people in favour of the doctrine it embodies.

20. "Several other things might be noticed corroborative of what has been already said. As the Virgin was prayed for in ancient days after her death, so there is no proof that she was prayed to. Where we have a pretty detailed account of the death of the saints of old, as of St. Ephrem, or St. Augustine, or St. Bede, not a word occurs about their commending themselves to the Virgin. While it is easy to produce a certain number of instances of the invocation of other saints in the five first centuries, there is perhaps but one solitary instance of a person invoking the Virgin, and that is one

° Book xv. cap. 3. vol. v. p. 109. I have not the books he refers to, viz. Usher's answer to the challenge, p. 136. and Dallæum de Pœnis et Sa-

tisf. lib. v. c. viii. but am told Usher's are fairly referred to. But it is answered in the twelfth chapter, §. 22. as protestants are sometimes puzzled by it.

Justina, mentioned by Nazianzen. Now admitting to the full that he approved of such invocations, where is the proof that he thought it any better to invoke Mary, than John, or Peter, or Paul?<sup>f</sup> where the proof from genuine, not spurious, works of other Fathers, that she was ever invoked at all? Instances given from St. Ephrem, (of whom, I repeat, there is no Benedictine edition,) are taken from works, which the honest Petavius and the accurate Tillemont discard as spurious, and which even the more easily satisfied Trombelli<sup>g</sup> dares not claim for genuine. It seems past all credit, that the ‘*disciplina arcani*,’ which you introduce like a ‘*Deus ex machinâ*,’ to save your credit, should have enabled the Church to keep her secret so perfectly, that it only oozed out in the case of one solitary woman! ‘It is no such wonder, if she fell into this, being a woman.’ When you go even to the martyrs, whom you might expect in their torments occasionally to let the secret transpire; you will search Ruinart’s acts of Western, and Asseman’s of Eastern martyrs in vain, to find an instance of invoking Mary’s aid. This being so, I am not prepared to listen to you, when you marshal before me Litanies of the eleventh century as a proof of what was felt, and thought, and believed six hundred years before.”

21. The words of the devil’s advocate are ended.

<sup>f</sup> See vol. i. p. 341. title, for chap. xii. §. 21.

a probable proof, and comp.      <sup>g</sup> De Beatâ, vol. v. p. 205-7.

## CHAP. XI.

### MODES OF MEETING THE FOREGOING OBJECTIONS.

1. THERE are two precepts in Scripture which occur together: 'Answer a fool according to his folly:' and, 'Answer not a fool according to his folly.' It might not be impertinent to take this to mean, either argue with him upon his own absurd principles, or convince him of the reasonableness of your own. Now although the objections, which have been put forward in the last chapter, are supposed to be the objections not of a fool, in the scriptural sense of the word, but of an earnest enquirer; still the mode of answering them, which these two texts suggests, may be useful. If the person here spoken of *is* an earnest enquirer, the answer to his difficulties need not be such as will remove the whole weight of them considered as speculative difficulties. A practical answer will suffice for such an enquirer.

2. Now the authors to whom he refers for his most weighty objections were all great upholders of the power of the Saints as intercessors for us: this he has candidly acknowledged, and no fair person can question, that whatever becomes of Scripture, tradition certainly favours such invocations. Invoke the saints then: beg of them to know through their prayers, if it is or is not right to honour Mary as we do. Dare God's saints to lead you into error; and we shall feel quite sure



then, that you are no mere antiquarian admirer of the early ages, which are too far off to punish you for disloyalty, but that you have a filial affection for their belief and practices, which leads you to *act* in as dutiful obedience to those ages, as if they were looking on close at hand. There is no royal road to geometry: but there is a royal road to theology of this practical kind, and that royal road is prayer. ‘Ora fortiter, et fideliter,’ said the doctor of grace.

3. But as there is reason to fear, that the enemy of the soul may find out excuses against practical answers of this sort, as moreover speculative answers, if honest ones, do all that practical answers can do, so far as the head, and not the heart, is concerned; some sort of an attempt at a speculative answer to these objections shall be made here. It shall be honestly and frankly stated, that, *if taken one by one*, there are some of them to which I at present see no full and satisfactory answer. Nevertheless, they are but difficulties in the way of other counter-evidence: many of them may be reduced in a considerable degree: when this is the case with individual objections, their joint weight must be diminished also, and that considerably; and the thing which the mind has to decide upon is, whether all the objections taken together do or do not countervail all the arguments in favour of devotion to Mary taken together. Only it should be remembered, that in weighing the two, we are not to act as if we were determining which of two theories in any matter of physical science is truest: for the question at issue will always be a practical question: ‘Have I sufficient grounds for neglecting so great salvation, as may be obtained through Mary, if by any chance

the major part of Christians should prove after all to be in the right?"

4. Remembering then that this is, and must be, a practical question, let us consider, whether the end and object for which these objections were raised, is effected by them; whether, that is, their joint weight is such as to establish the conclusion they aim at establishing. Now that conclusion is this, that either the Establishment, or some phase of anti-Roman religion, is more conformable to the Scripture, or more conformable to the early Church, than is the Church of Rome, as she now is. We will consider then, first, which of the two is most conformable to Scripture, and afterwards, which of the two is more conformable to tradition, or the early Church. If it can be made out, that we are the more conformable to either of these, then the end or object of those objections has failed, even if in themselves they can be quite substantiated. Because though (not true, but) unanswerable, when taken one by one, they do not destroy, but only diminish the weight of other proofs. A man should be an atheist who could deny this: for proofs from Nature that God is just and good, or from prophecy that Christ is the Messiah, are not destroyed, because of the difficulties occasioned by some facts or texts. First then it will be attempted to shew, that the end or object the objector has in view is not answered by what he says: and afterwards, that the particular things he urges may be explained, or have their force materially weakened. This method shall be adopted, first with the objections from Scripture, and then with those from tradition.

5. First, it is said by the objector to be plain, that Scripture is protestant, not catholic, upon the subject

of the Virgin. Now remarks already made\* will have enabled the reader to see, that if there be such things as vocations to a state of poverty, chastity, or obedience, then certain things in our Saviour's conduct towards his Mother are perfectly intelligible. He has to set an example to men in stages of life, at which Protestantism is not a spectator, but for which, if fair minded, it will allow.

6. But not to insist on these less obvious things : is it most like Protestantism, or most like Catholicism, to represent the beloved disciple of Christ as bequeathed by Christ to his Mother for a son as he dies, and as taking her from that hour to his own home ? Yet Scripture represents Christ as doing so. Or, if you say, that this applies to one man only, and is no example of the way Christ will deal with all he loves ; what can you make of the assertion, that all generations will call Mary blessed ? This is not true of generations of Vipers, nor of generations of Pagans, nor of generations of Jews, nor of generations of Protestants. But it is true to the letter of all generations of Catholics. Our common conversation, our sermons, our prayer books, our missals, our breviaries, all attest the truth of this. ' The Blessed,' with no other addition, is constantly used for our Lady in the Rubrics. But any one who has mixed in protestant society knows perfectly well, that it is not the general habit of protestants to call her Blessed. ' The Virgin' is her common name with them.—There was once a Person who said, " By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned : " and, " out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh : " and, " he shall judge the world by that word which he hath spoken."

\* Above, chap. i. §. 4. chap. v. §. 9. chap. vi. §. 4.

7. Again, it is said in Scripture, that a sword should pass through the Virgin's own soul. Now supposing it be not right to take this sword of the sword of doubt, i. e. temptation to doubt, as many early Fathers did<sup>b</sup>: supposing the interpretation put upon the passage above has not been made good: still what has the protestant, of any kind, to give him an interest in this passage? What is it to him but a curious fact, which explains what the Romanists mean by the *Stabat mater*, which he hears occasionally in a concert, but explains nothing in his own creed? If a sword did pass through her heart, what was the good of telling us of it, if we are to have no meditations, nor devotions, nor pictures, nor images to bring before us the dolours of Mary? 'Under the apple-tree Christ raised us up: there our Mother was corrupted, there she was defloured that bore us<sup>c</sup>.' There the sword pierced her heart, there she bore us as children, there she shared Christ's passion, in order to become Mother to us all. Explain Simeon's words so, and there is some sense in inserting them into the Canon of Scripture: but what is there in protestantism to give them any kind of meaning? If Mary's sorrows do not reveal the thoughts of our hearts, these words are of no use: I will speak for myself; I will ask my fellow-converts, if they ever had any meaning to them before they knew the truth as it is in Jesus<sup>d</sup>?

<sup>b</sup> See Trombelli, vol. iv. p. 223. Petav. de Inc. xiv. ibi cit.

<sup>c</sup> Cant. viii. 5. Comp. Ghisler ad loc. p. 908.

<sup>d</sup> In connection with Mary's bitter pangs in bearing us, it may be observed, that the name of Mary is, as it appears from

Scripture, too common to have any very recondite meaning in it. If it is not wrong to say so, the common interpretations of it seem to me perfectly absurd. How '*star of the sea*' can come out of the letters, I do not know, unless it was forced into



8. What has been said in regard to the mention of our Lady in the New Testament, will apply in a good measure to the types and prophecies of her in the Old. People who do not hold the doctrine implied in Ezekiel<sup>d</sup>, cannot expect to see the Blessed Virgin there. And so people who do not believe that she is our Mediatrix, in any sense, will not see any type of her in the great female deliverers of the Jews. When they have lost the doctrine, they cease to see the Scripture proofs of it. Who would expect it to be otherwise? A Socinian does not see proofs of Christ's Divinity, not because they are not in certain texts, but because he has lost the doctrine which makes him look for them. Several passages of the Old Testament referring to our Lady will be placed connectedly before the reader in the third part, so that upon this more need not be said here. What has been said already shews, that the silence of Scripture has been greatly overrated by the objector, because there are passages which meet a clear interpretation with our notions, and none with his.

9. Before considering whether the single difficulties which he urges from the New Testament can be

מָאֹר ים : Lady it cannot be, for that would be Martha. 'Rebellion' is the sense Gesenius gives it, which suits perhaps with Miriam, the original form of the name. But the radical sense is 'bitterness,' 'rebellion,' the derivative. Possibly the very name was meant to keep always before us the bitter pangs of her who bore us, it will do so without any strained etymology. The queer meanings affixed to it by the Fathers probably originate in their being obliged to ask Jews about it,

and being either misunderstood from the way they put the question, or else made game of by the answerer. It seemed useful to say thus much to shew, that when we put confidence in Mary's name against Satan, it is from what it will remind him of, and not from any heathenish superstition about its letters or meaning, alone and without that memento.

<sup>d</sup> Ezek. xliv. See above, chap. iii. §. 8. &c.



explained or diminished, let it be observed here in regard to the allegories and types in the Old Testament, which our doctrine explains, that both the Old and the New Testament lead us to expect that there will be allegories to explain: that the same tender spirit which easily throws itself into devotion to the Blessed Virgin, also easily learns truth from allegories; for allegories are to childlike minds what fables are to children: that if all allegories are discarded, Tertullian's acute saying, 'that which is found to be one, though in many minds, is not an invention, but a tradition,' will be good for nothing: that samples of such interpretation have been already given<sup>f</sup>: and that proofs of this kind are peculiarly suited to probe the disposition of those out of the Church, and see if they are docile and childlike: but almost all the holy Fathers *argue* from allegorical passages, and certainly all distinguished for devotion to Mary<sup>g</sup>. Of course, allegory is only a proof, in whatever degree it is a proof, of those doctrines for which there is proof from other sources: because, if they hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not believe plainer evidence.

10. But let us consider, if the silence of the New Testament upon Mary's privileges admits of any solution. It will be found, that the supposition that the Evangelists had a supreme deference for her, explains it quite as easily, as any opposite supposition. This the following reflections will shew. Inspiration must not be assumed to dispense with the ordinary means of acquiring knowledge, such as inquiry of eyewitnesses, when a fact is to be ascertained. If St. Luke, who has told us the most about our Lord's infancy and childhood, had said nothing whatever to

<sup>f</sup> See chap. i. §. 3. §. 14. and part iii. chap. i. chap. iii. §. 7. chap. xiii. §. 28.      <sup>g</sup> See p. 39. n. e.

lead us to think he used diligent enquiry to come at the facts, still we might fairly have assumed that he did use such enquiry. But as it is, he expressly tells us, that the reason why he wrote on the subject, was because he had accurately followed up all the circumstances from the first <sup>h</sup>; and he says, it seemed good to him *also* to do so, though others who had heard from those who had been eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word from the beginning, had written Gospels. Now what eyewitness of the Word from the beginning but Mary, there was to consult, it is not very easy to say. St. Joseph was certainly dead before the Crucifixion, as he would else have been at the Passover, and have been the proper person to have entrusted Mary to. St. Luke therefore had recourse to our Lady for information, and recounts those events of the sacred Pregnancy, which a 'Physician' would naturally have inquired about. There is no symptom of inspiration neglecting natural means in all this.

11. Again, St. John, who beyond all doubt was acquainted with the Blessed Virgin, had opportunities of hearing from her of the conception, i. e. 'what was from the beginning,' of the Visitation and Nativity, i. e. 'what we have *heard*;' and of knowing the Personal appearance of Jesus, that is, 'what we have seen with our eyes;' and the miracles, transfiguration, agony, and passion, i. e. 'what we have been spectators of,' and the resurrection, that is, 'what we have felt with our hands concerning the Word of life.' Whatever you may think of this way of explaining the beginning of his first Epistle, it certainly seems as if St. John was going through the different events of

<sup>h</sup> παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς. See Wetstein on the beginning of St. Luke.

our Lord's life from first to last, and encouraging the disciples to trust to ear-witnesses and eye-witnesses for the truths he had preached to them. But this is less certain than the passage of St. Luke. Nevertheless, what from St. Luke is certain of one Evangelist, that we may feel next to certain was the case with all. But if the Evangelists depended upon the Blessed Virgin for their information, and there is consequently no reason to make a miraculous, where a natural, source is at hand, then she could make her own terms.

12. The Magnificat shews us what sort of Gospel Mary would dictate, viz. one in which all her own privileges were kept as much out of sight, and all that tended to humble herself in men's eyes put as much forward, as possible. Hence we see why things that seem at first sight to be disparaging to her are inserted; humility, even in ordinary saints, rejoices in having such things put forward. A blind obedience to Mary's will then, will account for the little that the Evangelists say of her, quite as well, to say the least, as the supposition that they thought but little of her. It is worth remarking, that the Gospel written last of all contains in our view of the matter two things regarding Mary; one is, that the first miracle is done in obedience to her, and the other is, that *after* Jesus had made John her son, John always introduces himself as 'that disciple whom Jesus loved.' We will say nothing here of allusions to her in the Apocalypse, as 'Ark of the Covenant,' or, the Tabernacle which was blasphemed, or, as a 'woman clothed with the sun.' When the pressure of Mary's humility is removed, St. John<sup>i</sup> begins to disclose her prerogatives with her Son, even after he had com-

<sup>i</sup> Ἰωαννῆς, οἷα δὴ μετὰ παρρησίας μητέρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ προσηγόρευσεν. θεολογῶν, ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς Greg. Nyss. iii. p. 413. a.

menced his ministry. St. John does this after her departure, even at the sacrifice of his own humility.

13. Now if any one replies to this, that if the veneration and worship of the Virgin was of as great consequence as it has been represented in this book to be, it pertained to the Providence of God to see that a thing so important was fully declared in his revelation to man ; we answer, that we most fully admit. Nevertheless, revelation consists of scripture *and* tradition, the written *and* the living oracles of God, and hence whoever will be saved must hold fast the traditions delivered to the saints once for all. But if scripture is deficient upon the point of Mary's privileges, nobody will be therefore safe for neglecting to profit by them : for scripture takes good care to inform you, that there is another source to draw the waters of salvation from : 'Stand fast,' says St. Paul, 'and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our Epistle.' Hence, if the epistles say nothing about our Lady, the traditions learnt by word might have said a great deal about her. St. Paul might have taught his disciples to call her 'blessed,' by epistle : but he does not do so. He might have taught that John was made her son at the crucifixion by epistle ; but he does not do so. He might have told them, when recommending obedience and respect to parents, that Jesus was subject to Mary at Nazareth, did a miracle to please her at Cana, and thought of her in his torments on the Cross, by epistle ; but he does not do so. Yet there would have been nothing 'unscriptural' in all this : a pious protestant might have said it. Nay, it would have been 'unscriptural' to omit it, unless he had also given them traditions by word to hold fast.

13. The silence of the New Testament then may



be explained, by remembering that Christians learn their religion by tradition : the Apostles learnt from Mary, and the first Christians from the Apostles. This is the case with the silence of scripture, even when it is not overstated : but the reader has been also reminded, that it may be overstated. The same is the case with the silence of tradition : it is in part overstated, in part it may be explained. Let us proceed to attempt to shew, that these two statements can be made credible also.

14. The objector, in the last chapter, states the matter in such a way as to make a person believe, if either very ignorant, or very unreflecting, or very prejudiced, that the feeling of the Church of the first four or five centuries is with protestantism, and against Catholicism. And if protestantism were a culprit, and the objector counsel for it, such a mode of defending his client would be perfectly fair: he would be bound to make the best of his client's cause, even if he knew it was a bad one. But such a defence will not satisfy a person who feels that the cause is his own cause, and that his own soul is at stake; who feels that he may be pleading, in fact, the cause of nature against that of grace. Such a one will consider, not the marks of similarity between the ancient and modern Churches which are wanting, but also those that are there. In order to see how matters will then stand, let us suppose, that an enthusiastic protestant had been attempting to convert a plain-minded Catholic from 'his errors,' and that he had proceeded so far, as to have induced the latter to promise upon oath, that he would join the Establishment, if it could be proved that the ancient Church was more of its mind about 'the Virgin' than the modern Church of Rome. We will suppose the unfortunate man capable of appreciating all that was



urged in the last chapter; and little as he liked his bargain, yet, like Herod for his oath's sake, he was about to abandon his religion upon hearing what was there stated. Will any one's conscience say that the miserable man would not be greatly relieved, when, besides passages in favour of tradition, purgatory, invocation of saints, the Real Presence, and Sacrifice, the following facts and passages bearing upon the worship of our Lady were placed before him?

15. St. Epiphanius, whom the protestant homilies allow to have been a 'godly Bishop,' and who died in the year 403, gives us an account of certain women who offered a kind of sacrifice to Mary. He blames them on two grounds; first, because no woman, not even 'Mary, who was counted worthy to receive God the Sovereign of Heaven, the Son of God, in her bosom<sup>j</sup>,' was allowed to officiate as *priest*, or do any sacred office in the Church: and next, because they paid divine honours to her, excusing themselves by saying, 'We honour the Queen of Heaven,' restoring certain heathen rites in so doing<sup>k</sup>. This 'godly Bishop' might have been expected to be carried a little too far by his zeal: instead of which he repeats again and again<sup>l</sup> that Mary is to be honoured, but not worshipped. 'In honour be Mary,' he says, 'but let the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost be worshipped<sup>l</sup>.' He employs himself also with shewing that she is of the same *nature* as we are<sup>m</sup>. Now an abuse of this sort implies something to be abused. Our adversaries sometimes say, that one reason why any reverence for Mary is wrong, is because it is so liable to abuse. But a thing must exist first, in order to be liable to

<sup>j</sup> Vol. i. p. 1059. d.

p. 1066. d.

<sup>k</sup> p. 1065. c.

<sup>m</sup> p. 1062. sq.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. 1064. d. p. 1065. b.

any thing. Let them imagine to themselves then a something or other which existed somewhere between the years 350 and 400, liable to abuse : whatever this same thing was, it is a fact, that certain Arabian and Thracian women contrived to pervert it to idolatrous purposes. This is a fact : but it is also a fact, that a 'godly Bishop' and a Catholic too, rose immediately against this abuse. There is no proof that it spread far and wide : and it would be uncharitable to assume that other godly bishops would not rise up in other parts of the world, and put it down if it had spread in this manner. It is quite plain that Epiphanius means Mary to have some honour, but objects to her being 'worshipped,' if by worship is meant the honour paid to the Trinity, to whom alone sacrifice may be offered.

16. Although St. Austin in his book on heresies passes over this sect, we can make it pretty clear, that this is the sort of honour which he also would have objected to giving to the Blessed Virgin. There were wise people in his day, who thought such reverence was very liable to abuse. Cautiousness of this kind is not at all the monopoly of the three last centuries : but we find it strongly developed in the Manichean Faustus. 'You have turned their sacrifices into love feasts,' he says, 'and their idols into Martyrs, whom you worship with similar devotion'.<sup>n</sup> St. Austin in reply says, that 'Christ's people frequent the Memories of the Martyrs with religious solemnities, both to excite imitation of them, and to have a share in their merits, and to be helped by their prayers ; yet in such way as not to set up *Altars* to any of the Martyrs, but to the God of the Martyrs only. For what bishop, when he is at the

<sup>n</sup> Ap. August. c. F. xxi. 4.

Altar in places where the saints' bodies are, ever said, We offer to thee, Peter, or to thee, Paul, or to thee, Cyprian? For what is offered, is offered to the God who crowned the Martyrs, at the Memories of those whom he crowned, that owing to the suggestion of the places themselves, a stronger feeling may spring up to sharpen our charity both towards those whom we are capable of imitating, and towards him by whose assistance we can imitate them. We worship the Martyrs then with that worship of love and fellow-feeling with which even in this life the saints of God are worshipped, when we see the heart of these ready for a like passion for the sake of the truth of the Gospel. But the former we worship the more devoutly, the more safely we can do it, now their struggles are over, and praise them as victors now in the happier life with praise more confident, than that which we bestow upon those who are still fighting in this life. But with that worship which is called in Greek *Latria*, but in Latin cannot be expressed in any one word, inasmuch as it is a service specially due to Divinity, we neither worship, nor teach men to worship, any but God alone. Now since to this worship belongeth the oblation of sacrifice, whence idolatry is predicated of those who offer it even to idols, we do not offer any thing of the sort by any means, or order it to be offered either to any martyr, or to any holy soul, or to any angel: and *whoever* falls into such an error as this is reprov'd by sound doctrine, that he may either mend his ways, or else be shunned by others\*."

\* Cont. Faust. xx. 21. de §. 1. 284. §. 5. 285. §. 5. 286.  
Trin. i. 13. Maxim. ii. 23. §. 3. §. 2—4. De Civit. Dei, xxii. 10.  
Epist. 102. §. 20. 170. §. 2. in Psalm 135. §. 3. fin. in Joan.  
Serm. 273. §. 7. comp. 159. tr. 84. de Cura Mortuor. v. init.

17. This is not a thing which the holy doctor speaks of once only, but one frequently inculcated by him. He explicitly states, that if any body confused the worship of the saints with that due to God, he would be reproved for it, and the conduct of Epiphanius is an example, of which this is the rule. He states also, that the worship we pay to martyrs is what we pay to saints on earth, we not being, as Protestants make themselves, strangers and pilgrims, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and able to ask them both to pray for us, and to do other such neighbourly acts for us, as rich fellow-citizens ought to do in return for homage shewn to them. Now when the poor Catholic found that St. Austin's principles justified St. Epiphanius's conduct, and shewed that Mary must not have sacrifice offered to her, he would take courage and say, there is no chance of protestants offering sacrifice to her, because they have discarded all sacrifice from their system; but there is no chance of Catholics doing so either, because it was ever held to be wrong. But where an abuse exists, there a use must exist first, and I see that in Epiphanius's time such a use must have existed, and such an abuse was objected to in the fourth century by him, as well as by Benedict XIV. who checked tendencies in the same direction in the eighteenth century <sup>p</sup>.

18. This then may be looked upon as an instance to shew, that the silence of tradition may be over-rated. And indeed Epiphanius mentions, in speaking of the Blessed Virgin, other things in regard to her Nativity and Death, which may be noticed by and by. But the same godly Bishop and Hierome wrote also in defence of the ever-virginity of Mary, a doctrine,

<sup>p</sup> See above, vol. i. p. 390. t.



which is not familiar to protestants as a doctrine at all, which is no where explicitly taught in their formularies, and which is written against with impunity by their learned men. Thus the very learned Mr. Greswell, in a work printed at the University Press, is not ashamed to quote a series of heretics to shew, that her ever-virginity was not a thing necessary to believe<sup>a</sup>, little dreaming, that Satan might have forecast enough to prepare him a semblance of antiquity against Mary's honour<sup>r</sup>. What has been here said of the ever-virginity of Mary as an ancient Catholic doctrine, might be also said of the title Theotocos, or Mother of God. It is carefully expunged from the Protestant Prayer-book, and exceedingly rife in all Catholic books of devotion, public or private. St. Cyril, as has been suggested above<sup>s</sup>, would have found himself at home in the Catholic Church of this day, and would have fancied somehow or other that they were heretics, who neglected to use this very ancient title of honour for Mary. The supernatural way too in which Mary brought forth God was before the minds of the ancients: it is wholly ignored by our unfortunate neighbours in the Establishment, viewed as a living body. On these three points then the ever-virginity of Mary; the fact, that she is Mother of God; the fact, that the Birth as well as Conception of God was miraculous; the modern Church so clearly is in harmony with the ancient, the protestant Establish-

<sup>a</sup> Vol. ii. p. 111. notes on Diss. xvii. to the Harmony of the Gospels. May the blessed Virgin, who knows how to forgive her enemies, put it into the hearts of her friends to pray for this humble-minded

and immensely learned writer! Those who have known him, will sympathize with this wish.

<sup>r</sup> See Tromb. ii. p. 427 sq. and upon this *μεθόδεια τοῦ διαβόλου*, see further in part iii.

<sup>s</sup> Vol. i. p. 172.



ment so at variance with it, that any of the ancient saints would find that 'Anglio cared for none of these things.' But notice will be taken a little farther on of some further proofs, that the silence of the ancient Church has been greatly overrated by the objector in the last chapter.

19. It has been hinted already, that some people think the worship of Mary so liable to abuse, that even if it could be made out to be tenable in theory, it would not be wise to adopt it in practice. Now the consideration of this will lead us to consider also, whether the silence of antiquity admits of being explained. That such silence may be overrated has been already shewn, and will be farther shewn presently. But I can conceive a person arguing somewhat as follows: Almighty God gives men reason, notwithstanding its extreme liability to abuse, not merely by ingenious adulterers or cunning murderers, but by far the largest portion of those to whom he gives that gift. Now if this is so, how came the Church, who is bound to imitate his liberality, to be so stingy in disclosing her belief of Mary's power, if she really had such belief? Why did she not, even in early times, preach to the people at large upon the subject of the Virgin's intercession? To this we might be disposed to answer by another question: 'How came Almighty God, who knew himself and his own power from all eternity, to be so long before he introduced into the world the doctrine of the Trinity? He knew he could give power to believe: why then did he go on for four thousand years saying so much of the Unity, and speaking so obscurely and vaguely of the Trinity?' For the question here is, not whether the Church knew Mary's preeminence or not; but why, if she

knew it, she did not preach it? And consequently, it is fair to ask in reply, Why, if God knew the doctrine of the Trinity, he did not preach it? It is plain, that whatever will make the one consistent with wisdom, will go a good way to make the other consistent also. Let us see, then, if some answer cannot be given which will serve to throw light upon both these points.

20. Now we have in a Scripture a clue furnished us both to the one and to the other. We are told, that even to the Jews Moses did not publish the true doctrine of marriage, ‘because of the hardness of their hearts:’ we are told, that there were places where our Lord himself *could* not do any miracles, because of the unbelief prevailing there<sup>t</sup>. The doctrine preached then, as distinguished from the doctrine known by the teacher, may sometimes not be equal in extent to what the teacher knows, but be put forth or withheld according as it is or is not suitable to the hearers. I say sometimes, because the case of Tyre and Sidon shews that God does not always give even where it would be used<sup>u</sup>. When the Church was but a minority in the world, it might not be expedient to make every thing, actually held, a part of public teaching. The Church had first to eradicate Polytheism by teaching the Unity: then, when heretics denied the doctrine of the Trinity, to maintain this doctrine as a mean between the singularity of the Jews, and the Polytheism of heathens. When the people at large had got some hold upon this sacred doctrine, then she had to embarrass them with the doctrine of the Incarnation. After that, the doctrine of the Eucharist had to be taught, the

<sup>t</sup> Mark vi. 5, 6.

§. 35.

<sup>u</sup> See August. de Don. Pers.

time, and place, and manner of offering, which was kept a secret from the unbaptized <sup>v</sup>.

21. Now religion, considered as the possession of the multitude, is essentially a traditional thing: the very hold the Establishment has on some within it is a proof of this. The aberrations of centuries cannot be eradicated from the mind of the multitude as such, in a hurry: some there always will be who get but a half hold of their religion, and are more likely to confuse and obliterate what they have learnt, by being told too much, than to see it more clearly. Learned men and doctors may imbibe the whole of Catholic truth, and the poorest, if very good, reduce themselves to an exact conformity with its details, even where that truth, as a system, has not been to them an heirloom, and the atmosphere in which they breathed: but the children of Abraham, who are to call Mary blessed, are to be as the sand of the sea for multitude: the net includes not only bad and very good, but also indifferently good <sup>x</sup>. Hence, until a doctrine, or all the antecedents of it, have got a fair root in men's minds, the public, ordinary, and indiscriminate preaching of it may be quite out of place. But it does not the least follow, that, because it was not preached, therefore it was not held. The mention of the word 'Trinity,' occurs only once or twice in the Acts of the early Martyrs <sup>y</sup>; and no one instance of the use of this word occurs in the New Testament. St. Basil forebore to *call* the Holy Spirit God, and the same question puzzled sundry Councils <sup>z</sup>.

<sup>v</sup> Aug. Epist. 140. §. 48.  
'Magnum sacramentum est in  
sacrificio Novi Testamenti quod  
ubi et quando et quomodo offeratur,  
quando baptizatus fueris,  
invenies.'

<sup>x</sup> V. Lupus de Contritione  
et Attritione, v. fin.

<sup>y</sup> Ruinart, p. 221. p. 408.

<sup>z</sup> Catalani in Ecum. i. p. 161.  
p. 164.

St. Austin no where in his genuine writings invokes any Saint or Martyr, though he so distinctly held, as we have seen, that they might be invoked. It is unscriptural to call God the Trinity, unscriptural to call the Holy Ghost God, unscriptural to invoke the Saints, if by unscriptural is meant, that it is not found in words in Scripture: but one is as much deducible from Scripture as the others.

22. The mode of meeting the difficulty, drawn from the silence of the Fathers, then, which is adopted here, is this: first, by furnishing samples of things in which they clearly agree with the modern Church, and disagree with bodies out of the Church: and secondly, by shewing that there is a reason, why they should not say all which they held. That the amount of their silence has been greatly overrated in the objections, will be shewn further in the next chapter. But it may be added here, that this is not a mere invention to make an answer up with, but one which really appears to my own mind satisfactory. The machinery of the universe is God's own making, and he does not choose to break it to pieces, even in order to counteract the evil man has introduced into it. He prefers to introduce new movements into it, which act gradually upon what is actually existing in it. That the religion of the masses is a traditionary thing, is a fact: that the ignorance and prejudices of the multitude are not gotten under in a short period, is a fact of the same nature as the fact, that individuals are creatures of habit. The heathen had to learn by degrees, that a Virgin could have a Son: the world had to be familiarized by degrees with the items of Christianity, and God's skill and prudence (if the terms may be allowed) is shewn in so overruling the teachers of

his religion, that they apprized the world without, by degrees, of the mysteries they were commissioned to deliver. In this way, the prejudices of one generation of heathen gave ground enough, to put the next generation in a fairer position for learning the truth. Whether Christians held that truth from the first, can only be made certain by some revelation.



## CHAP. XII.

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS.

1. WHETHER or no Christians held the same ideas of the Blessed Virgin as Catholics now hold, is a thing which we have no natural means of finding out to a certainty. But of this we may be quite certain, that if Catholics of the present day have the appearance of holding *more* than ancient Catholics used to hold, there is no appearance whatever of the former dropping any thing which the latter used to hold. Hence it is fair to say, that what we hold now is *consistent* with what the ancients held, if you take it as a mass, and do not linger over isolated and irreducible objections, such as are incident to all matters of this nature. Thus you can conceive the present Church of Rome making as much stir against the man who denied that Mary was Mother of God, as was made in a General Council in the fifth century. Nobody would be surprised at this: whereas all protestant countries would be astonished, if the Establishment anathematized a man who held Nestorian doctrine on this point. If Rome let in such doctrine, all her formularies would require altering: if England let it in, none of them would require the least change. The reason is, because the one has a fervent vital belief in what was taught at Ephesus, the other has not; or, in other words, that modern Rome is *consistent* with ancient Ephesus, Windsor is not.

2. Now the defence set up in the last chapter for the silence of the Fathers, evidently will apply chiefly to popular didactical works, and we may expect to find in more learned and polemical works occasional passages, where the authors spoke without restraint such as was there contemplated. Of course, even in these the existing errors of the day will very much modify the authors' statements: it is known, that the reason alleged even in early times to excuse earlier Fathers for statements apparently heretical, was, that they wrote fearlessly, where there was no particular heresy to put them upon their guard. Still the case of the spurious passages cited in the Breviary, illustrates what is here referred to: they are almost every single one of them from sermons or didactic works. But the objector has not noticed, that there are several which are perfectly genuine, taken from books of a less popular description. It may seem, in the eyes of some, unfortunate for this country, where the genuine works of the Fathers meet with some respect, that no Urban the VIIIth should have weeded these passages out of the Breviary; but the Church is deliberate in her movements, and criticism not infallible in its conclusions, and the number of ancient works to select from, even if such a process were thought expedient, is upon the increase. These last, however, (e. g. the works of St. Ephrem,) want subjecting to criticism themselves; and when that is done, then it may or may not seem desirable to cast out the spurious passages, which certainly sometimes lead to unfortunate mistakes, and to replace them with genuine ones.

3. However, a few of the passages used in the Breviary shall be given here, together with a few which are not used, that the reader may judge

whether the positive evidence furnished by what we have of ancient authors sides with the Catholic or with the Protestant view of the Blessed Virgin. So many passages bearing this way have been given already<sup>a</sup>, that it will not be necessary to adduce any great number here: neither is it thought necessary to give the passages exactly as they occur in the Breviary, when taken from it; sometimes more and sometimes less than what is there given, as may seem convenient. Of course, it is very hard to please every body by quotations: the same mind at different times views the same passage in different lights: two minds, in still more different lights. Still with honest intentions, a wrong general impression is not likely to be given, nay hardly possible to be given, by a number of passages. Those who carp at trifling mistakes, if any such there be, in single passages, and pretermitt the impression they ought to receive from the whole, as a whole, on the strength of such mistakes, are unfair to any author, and dishonest to their own souls in a case of the present nature. They are like the mean artizan, who quarrelled with an accurate portrait, because the shoe-latchet was defective. But as a whole there is no doubt whatever, that the ancient and modern Church are like each other in their reverence for Mary.

4. St. John Damascene, as he is, though of the eighth century, a great follower of the ancients, may be cited first. "This Blessed [woman], who had been honoured with supernatural gifts at the time

<sup>a</sup> E. g. from St. Cyril above, 390. n. s. vol. ii. p. 42. p. 93. vol. i. p. 169. p. 204. q. p. 363. e. note g. from St. Ephrem, vol. i. vol. ii. p. 40. p. 99. m. from St. p. 429, &c. August. vol. i. p. 225. note m.

of the Passion, underwent those pangs which she escaped when bringing forth, having, owing to her maternal com-passion, endured the torture of her bowels, and when she saw him whom through his birth she knew to be God crucified like a malefactor, she was tortured in her thoughts as with a sword. And this is what that means: ‘And a sword shall go through thy own soul also.’ But the joy of the Resurrection, which proclaimed that he who died in the flesh was God, made the grief pass away<sup>b</sup>.” This was written with a hand said to have been restored by the Blessed Virgin, when cut off by the Iconoclasts<sup>c</sup>. The next passage may be taken from St. Maximus, who may be looked upon as a kind of master to St. John, and who lost his life for the truth’s sake, being martyred at eighty-two years of age by the emperor Constantius. “Our fathers said, that it was one and the same Word, both before the flesh and with the flesh, which flesh he did himself with a reasonable soul hypostatically unite to himself, it being taken from the holy Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, he having deigned to become the seed of his own Incarnation, that he might also be verily man, and shew by his conception, without seed, and by his scathless birth, that nature was being renewed, and that, without suffering, by the renewal, any deterioration<sup>d</sup>.” Here we see these two great Fathers clearly putting in as items in their view of the Incarnation, certain things which the modern Church holds about the Virgin<sup>e</sup> Mary, and the more ancient

<sup>b</sup> F. O. iv. 14.

<sup>c</sup> Vide Vitam in vol. i. p. xii.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. ii. p. 344.

<sup>e</sup> Petav. de Inc. xiv. 725.

Nemo non antiquorum docuit,

nemo nisi profanus negat, nihil ipsam in partu doloris expertam fuisse, uti nihil in conceptu voluptatis admisisset.

Church, as has been stated above, used to hold. Sophronius, who may be said to be master of Maximus, royally states the dignity of Mary, in a passage which we shall recur to by and by. Ildefonsus and Isidore, who will not be looked upon by protestants as men of much mind, shall be passed over here.

5. Touching Gregory the Great, it cannot be said that the originating devotions to the Blessed Virgin, or reflections upon her, seems to be one of his prerogatives. If it is, it has quite escaped my memory in what I have read of him. Nevertheless, it so happens, that there are two very ancient manuscripts of his Sacramentary, (written, according to the Benedictines, about the end of the eighth century,) in which is found an office for the Assumption of our Lady, and its Vigil. Pamelius thinks this Mass the work of some earlier writer. At all events, there is every reason to think that St. Gregory handed on, and loved the devotion which he found in being. He adopts St. Austin's mode of explaining our Lord's seeming disrespect to his Mother at the marriage feast<sup>f</sup>; he explains his seeming refusal to see her, as intended to be a type of something in his Church<sup>g</sup>; he recounts with full belief a vision in which she appeared to a little girl<sup>h</sup>; and is an eminently allegorical writer. It does not seem then, that what he positively says would tell at all for Protestantism, but against it. It may be added, that he was a great admirer of St. Jerome and St. Augustine.

6. St. Peter Chrysologus, speaking of the resurrection of Lazarus, writes as follows. "Martha is sent to Mary, because without Mary death could

<sup>f</sup> Epist. x. 36.

<sup>h</sup> Dial. iv. cap 1. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Hom. in Matt. iii. §. 1.



not be chased away, nor life restored. Let Mary come, let her that bears the Mother's name come, that man may see that Christ had dwelt in the secret abode of the Virgin's womb, to the end that the dead may come forth from hell, the dead issue from the sepulchres<sup>i</sup>." Again, in speaking of Christ's own Resurrection, he says: Mary [Magdalene] came. This is the name of Christ's Mother. So there came in the *name* a mother, there came a woman to be the Mother of the living, who had been made the mother of the dying, that it might be fulfilled which is written: 'this is the Mother of all living<sup>k</sup>.' "For on the very points in which Eve by being cursed had brought a punishment upon wombs, in those does Mary who is blessed then rejoice, gaining honour and respect. And then was she (woman) made by grace Mother of the living, who was mother of the dying by nature<sup>l</sup>, because, to each of other men grace gave itself by part, but to Mary, the whole fulness of grace gave itself at once<sup>m</sup>."

7. Next to this passage may conveniently be placed the one from St. Epiphanius, which is used in the Breviary. "This is she who is signified by Eve, who received the appellation of Mother of all living in a figure. For Eve is there called Mother of the living, even after she had been told, 'Earth thou art, and to earth shalt thou return,' after the transgression. And it was a marvel that after that transgression, she had this grand title given her. And, according to the exterior, the whole race of men upon earth was born from that Eve. But in this case, Life is truly born to the world from that Mary, that she might bring forth the Living One, and Mary

<sup>i</sup> Serm. 64.<sup>l</sup> Serm. 140.<sup>k</sup> Serm. 74.<sup>m</sup> Serm. 143.

be 'the Mother of the living.' By the 'Mother of all living' then as in a figure, Mary is meant. . . But there is another thing wondrous to think upon in these women, in Eve and Mary. For Eve was the pretext of death to mankind, inasmuch as it was through her that death entered into the world: but Mary was the pretext of life, through whom life was born to us. . . And where sin abounded, there grace did much more abound; and in that from which death originated, did life start, that he who was born from a woman as life to us, might become life instead of death, after shutting out death that was from a woman. And as in the one case Eve, when yet a virgin, was in the transgression of disobedience, so in the other the obedience of grace came in again through the Virgin, who had told to her the Gospel tidings of the descent from heaven—the presence of God in the flesh and eternal life. In the one case he says to the serpent, 'I will put enmities between thee and between her, and between thy seed and between her seed. But no where is a woman's seed found, and so it is only by a figure that the enmity and envy of the serpent and of the Devil who was in the serpent towards those born of Eve, can be taken of her'." Thus far the 'godly bishop,' Epiphanius. To the same purpose is St. Ephrem. "Adam was naked and beautiful, and his thrifty wife wrought and made for him a garment of shame. The garden which he had polluted saw it, and bewailed it. Mary begged for the garment that adorned the thief, and she cheered him by the promise. The garden (i. e. Paradise) saw him, and embraced him in Adam's stead." "Two innocent women, two simple-minded, Mary and also Eve, are placed in comparison. One was the cause of our death, the other

» Hær. lxxviii. 18.

° Vol. iii. p. 572. d.

the cause of our life. As for Eve, her singlemindedness was a stranger to subtlety, and she became without understanding. Mary, with discernment made her subtlety the salt of her single-mindedness. The salt of innocence has no savour without subtlety: nor is there any hope for the words of cunning without single-mindedness<sup>p</sup>." And in the next page he has the following: "Eve saw with her eye the beauty of the tree, and the counsel of the cunning one took shape in her mind, and the latter end of her action proved remorse of soul. With her ear Mary saw the Invisible come. With the voice was the Mighty conceived in her womb, who had come to take flesh. Death and Satan enquired, What rumour is this? while they stood both and heard the Angel-guard, that over him shouted, 'He puts death to death!' The evil one he frays away, the joy of celestials, of mortals the hope!" Again: "Eve with that vile and worthless serpent was not minded, glorious as she was, to turn his words back upon him, although his words were very questionable, and should have been fused in the assay-furnace, as she had splendour, he had vileness. Marvel we at Mary, who questioned even the great Angel and dreaded not, who asked him and feared not. Eve was not minded to question even the vile serpent that had no feet; the Virgin answered Gabriel. Mary did not question in order to pry into the Son of the Living One; it was about a mortal that she asked, since none knew her. Mary asked about things easy to

<sup>p</sup> Vol. ii. p. 327. see the whole sermon (on Gen. iii. 6.) St. E. uses the words rendered 'cunning,' and 'subtlety' here in a good sense; as when our

Lord says, Be *wise* as serpents—*φρονιμοὶ* is here taken from the Greek of the LXX. in Gen. iii. 1.

the True One; Eve received all manner of difficulties of a promiser. The mother of no discretion is the fountain of our troubles; and the Sister of understanding is the storehouse of our joys. The serpent, who ought to have been questioned, was not pried into, and Christ, who ought to be believed, is pried into. My brethren, sons of Eve, let us listen to the tale of our ancient mother's woe, which has past away by Mary's means<sup>1</sup>."

8. Before leaving the East, two short passages, one from Theodotus of Ancyra's sermon at Ephesus, and the other from St. Jerome, which both bring the Virgin in by the way, shall be cited. "He it was that then by power unspeakable drew the Magi to orthodoxy, who has now also called together this splendid assemblage, now no longer laid in a manger, but exposed on this redemptive Table! For that manger was the mother of this table, and therefore is he placed upon this, that he may be eaten upon it, and become a redemptive food to believers. So the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 321. c. The word ܐܝܬܐ here rendered, tale of woe,' ordinarily means a tale only: Asseman makes it 'the fall.' The root means to besmear, to stain, to paint, so possibly this derivative might mean 'the stain,' though this is against the usage of the language, which has transferred it from a painted representation to a historical one. I suspect there is some misprint. I may add, that these passages appear to me genuine: but that the Roman edition, as time will *probably* shew, deserves no confidence, that its translation is diluted and unfaithful, and

that no one therefore should rest *very much* on quotations from St. Ephrem without distinct reasons for doing so. The sermons here quoted are of the nature of those referred to in his commentary on Genesis, and the other book (de Paradiso) is, if I recollect right, cited by Moses Bar-Cepha de Paradiso. I have grounds for this assertion about St. Ephrem's works, which need not be given here; but to steal a march upon opponents in theology by the help of their ignorance is dishonest. It lacks 'the salt of single-mindedness.'



manger represented this glorious table, but the Virgin was the germ of the quires of virgins, and the poverty of the house in Bethlehem represented these brilliant shrines<sup>r</sup>. Here Theodotus regards the Real Presence as originating in Christ's Birth, Virginity as originating in Mary, the splendour of Churches as originating in the fact of God's residing in the flesh, in a given space. St. Jerome speaks as follows: "In a field of good land, even from one sowing, there springs up fruit, some thirty-fold, some sixty-fold, and some a hundred-fold: by the very numbers it is pointed out, that what springs up is unequal, yet each is perfect in its own kind. Elizabeth and Zacharias, whom you Pelagians use as an impenetrable shield for your doctrine, may teach us, how much inferior they are to the blessed Mary Mother of the Lord in sanctity, which from consciousness of the God that dwells within her freely exclaims; 'Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is mighty has done great things for me, and holy is his name. And his mercy is on them that fear him, from generation to generation. He hath done might with his Arm.' Now observe in this that she calls herself blessed, not by her own merit and virtue, but from the kindness of God that dwelt in her. Even John too, than whom there was no greater amongst those born of women, was better than his own parents. For he is by the testimony of the Lord compared not only to men, but to Angels. And yet he that was greater than all men on earth, is said to have been less than the least in the kingdom of heaven<sup>s</sup>." And the master<sup>t</sup> of St. Jerome had taught him, that Christ was "born of

<sup>r</sup> ap. Hard. i. p. 1652. e.  
Comp. §. 9.

<sup>s</sup> c. Pelag. Dial. i. §. 16.  
<sup>t</sup> Naz. p. 682. a.



a Virgin, who was previously purified by the Spirit both in soul and flesh, inasmuch as it was necessary that birth should be held in honour, but virginity in greater honour." So no doubt St. Jerome would have held Mary to be not the least in the kingdom of heaven.

9. Of his correspondent and admirer St. Augustine, we shall have to say so much in the Third Part, that one passage only shall be given here. "From Mary's un-spoiled Virginity holy nuns were born; you who despising this world's marriage have chosen to be virgins even in your flesh, celebrate with solemn joy the birth from a Virgin this day. He was born from a woman, who was sown in a woman without a male. He who brought you that which you were to love, did not take away from his Mother that which you love. She then whose footsteps you are following abode not with any man in order to conceive, and when she was bearing the Child remained a Virgin. Imitate her as much as you can. . . . . That which you wonder at in the flesh of Mary, do within the recesses of your soul. He that believes in the heart to justice, conceives Christ; he that confesses with the mouth to salvation, brings forth Christ. In this way in your minds let fruitfulness abound, and virginity continue<sup>u</sup>." We have heard of protestant nuns: but we cannot conceive the generality in the Establishment would say, that the holy doctor's address to his nuns was one they would wish to hear in *their* churches on a Christmas Day.

10. The great saint, who received St. Austin into the Church, in a similar manner holds up Mary as a sample to virgins: from his second book 'on Nuns' the Breviary cites the following passage: "Let the

<sup>u</sup> Serm. cxci. §. 4.

virginity and life of the blessed Mary be drawn out before you, as if in a picture, from whom as in a mirror is reflected the face of chastity and virtue's figure. From her you can gain a model of life; for in her as in a pattern the masterly rules of probity are so clearly expressed, as to shew what you ought to correct, what to avoid, and what to hold to. In learning, the prime stimulus is to be found in the nobleness of the teacher. Now what has more nobility than God's Mother? what brighter than she whom Brightness selected? what chaster than she who without the contact of a body gave birth to a Body? . . . . When did she ever hurt her parents' feeling, even by a look? when did she ever quarrel with her neighbours, or despise the humble, or deride the weak, or avoid the poor?" These are not the words of a man who never thought of the blessed Virgin, what her life was, what the traditions about her were, or what examples she had furnished. You might live out a whole life in the Establishment, and never hear or read any thing of the kind. Is this possible in the Church? Our enemies shall be judges.

11. Before St. Ambrose, lived St. James of Nisibis, who among other pupils had St. Ephrem. In one of his Sermons he has the following passage: "It is, my brethren, a thing we all know, and are sure of, that the enemy got an approach opened to him against men through a woman, and through her, as long as the world lasts, he will never cease to lay snares against us. She is the devil's artillery, and through her it is that he fights against those who are mortifying their lusts: and through her he has evermore chaunted his victories. She was his harp from the first day that ever was: through her the curse

of the law was laid on, and through her death had an opening to approach us given him. For it is in pains that she brings forth children, and gives them over to death. For her sake the ground was cursed to bring forth thorns and briars. But after blessed Mary came, the thorns were pulled out, and labour was taken away<sup>x</sup>." And of Gabriel he says; "He offered the prayers even of Mary before God<sup>y</sup>." "When Christ himself was announced, it was by the salutation he came to us, and it was *owing* to humility that Mary received him, when Gabriel saluted blessed Mary, and said, Hail, Mary, blessed art thou amongst women<sup>z</sup>."

12. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, will naturally be expected by Catholics to have a strong devotion to the blessed Virgin, as he was only one step removed from St. John himself. Unfortunately the original of his works is lost, and so we must trust to a very ancient Latin translation, made probably before Tertullian's time<sup>n</sup>. Protestants will be able to judge whether Catholics are disappointed in their expectations, and whether the following extract, part of which the Breviary gives, could be easily dovetailed into a protestant sermon. It runs as follows: "The Lord then plainly came to his own, and, while that of his own creating which he himself sustains then sustained himself, he wrought the undoing of that disobedience which took place with the tree [of knowledge] by that obedience which took place on the tree [of the Cross]: that seduction too was

<sup>x</sup> p. 210.

<sup>y</sup> p. 60.

<sup>z</sup> P. 273. It is fair to state, that there is nothing left but an Armenian translation of St. James: and that I am obliged

to trust to a Latin translation. But Neuman Gesch. der Arm. Literat. p. 19. expresses no doubt of their genuineness.

<sup>n</sup> See Massuet. ad vol. ii. p. 89.

put an end to, whereby the virgin Eve, already destined for a husband, was evilly seduced: of all these good tidings the Virgin Mary, already under a husband, was truly informed by an Angel. For as Eve was seduced by an angel's words to shun God after she had transgressed his word: so Mary also by an Angel's word had the glad tidings given her, that she might bear God, obeying his word. And if the former had disobeyed God, still the latter was persuaded to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might be the advocate [or paraclete] of the virgin Eve. And as the human race was fettered to death through a virgin, it is saved through a Virgin, the poise of the balance being restored; a virgin's disobedience is saved by a Virgin's obedience. For while the sin of the protoplast was still receiving correction through that punishment of his, the prudence of the Serpent having been overcome by the simplicity of the Dove, we were set free from those chains through which we had been bound to death<sup>b</sup>." This passage is a very important one, as it shews how ancient the far-spread practice of contrasting Eve and Mary was: St. Irenæus was removed by one step only from the apostles: and one of these had already drawn out the contrast between Christ and the first man. It was but natural to compare Mary and the first woman. St. Ephrem probably had seen this passage, and the simplicity he commends in Mary would shew who the Dove is that St. Irenæus speaks of. But be this as it may, it is quite plain that St. Irenæus lays a great deal more stress upon the Virgin's con-

<sup>b</sup> Iren. lib. v. cap. 19. §. 1. had the Greek, and put it into The end of the passage has a little more polished Latin been rendered according to St. than the rough provincial language of the existing Latin Austin's text: (c. Jul. Pel. i. version. §. 5.) as it is probable that he



sent to the Incarnation, and her obedience to God's will therein, than protestants would do. "The knot of Eve's disobedience, as he says elsewhere, met with its untying in Mary's obedience. For what the virgin Eve had tied by unbelief, that the Virgin Mary untied by belief<sup>c</sup>." If every priest in Italy said these words next Sunday, he would shock no one: could all the clergymen of the Establishment do so? Could Abraham find ten among them to save the city from the sin of having forsaken the truth about his daughter?

13. After all, then, the Fathers certainly have some passages not quite as reconcileable with protestantism as with popery. Making every allowance for their neglect to mention Mary, where one would expect it now-a-days, granting to the full that this silence is difficult in some cases to account for, still there are several passages which lead one to suppose, that in their secret hearts they would have had no objection or repugnance to the present devotions of the Church. This is an assertion which might be made, one should think, by a fair-minded protestant: intellectually, a protestant, who discards tradition altogether, is infinitely more consistent than one who pretends to go in any sense by tradition. It seems quite impossible for any honest mind to become acquainted with the writings of the Fathers, and not see that the whole tone and temper of them, taken as a whole, is absolutely and unequivocally against all religions but the Catholic. To rest on isolated passages which tell against this, betrays as great intellectual weakness as it does moral wrongness. It is looking for mathematical demonstration, where the case only admits of moral certainty.

14. This being so, if we once own that ancient

<sup>c</sup> Iren. iii. 22. fin. J. Martyr. c. Tryphon. p. 327. c.



writers who have said harsh things against the blessed Virgin, are Roman Catholics in other respects, the practical answer to the objections noticed above, suggests also a speculative one, which is this. If this or that Father says things discordant with Rome on one or two points, and in accordance with it on others, it is unphilosophical and absurd, and evinces an ignorance of the nature of moral evidence, to use the one or two cases against the many. Even inductive philosophy would scorn so mean a trick. But it will be still more odious to pretend to make friends of writers, whose whole bias you see to be against you, whose principles you dare not put in practice, and of whom you must feel if you think, that there is a chance that one or two discrepancies can be explained away. When we are convinced of a man's honesty, or good breeding, or politics, from thirty trials, we do not suppose that he has abandoned them, because there is one case which we cannot reconcile with our opinion of him: we say, 'I will wait till I can hear his explanation of it.' And there seems to be no doubt, that if we could hear what St. Chrysostome meant by certain untoward passages about our Lady, that we should find he had a very different thing in his mind from what some people suppose. It so often happens, that difficulties vanish when we come to know the whole of a case, that where we cannot know it we must presume they would. All that is necessary is to shew, that in other respects Chrysostome (and similar things might be said of others) adopts the principles which protestants are arguing against.

15. Now the objection which protestants feel to devotion to the Virgin is based, not upon any objection to the particular sort of mediatorial power the

Virgin has ascribed to her, but upon the whole notion of creatures being mediators at all. In fact, it is the same objection as is felt by infidels to a Mediator<sup>d</sup>. What is urged from St. Leo then may be met in the same way as what is urged from St. Chrysostome: both strongly hold the belief that creatures do intercede for us<sup>e</sup>. What then have you really gained by gaining Chrysostome to your side? if he is an authority in your eyes, why, then pray to the saints, reverence their relics, feel afraid of their power: if he is not, do not complain of us for setting him aside in one point. The question why he does not recommend especially to our notice the sanctity of our blessed Lady, is a curious question for learned Catholics to consider at their leisure, and puzzle out an answer to without the doctrine of developments if they can: but it is not a practical question to a person out of the Church. If he really goes by the authority of the Fathers, if his respect for them is not pretence and sham, then it is childish, not morally but intellectually childish, to object the authority of the Fathers, who strongly held the very principle of mediation which you detest.

16. Notwithstanding all this, I am fully prepared to admit, that the passages of St. Chrysostome constitute to us, not to other people but to us, a theoretical or speculative difficulty. And the difficulty lies in the fact which has been noticed above, that there are not (it seems) in St. Chrysostome, as in St. Cyril, other passages about the blessed Virgin which tell in

<sup>d</sup> See Butler, quoted above, i. p. 396. h.

<sup>e</sup> 'Videre est apud patres passim, *potissimum* apud Chrysostomum quantis honoribus

post datam Ecclesiæ pacem affectæ fuerunt Martyrum reliquiæ, &c.' Ruinart, Act. Martyr. p. lxxiv.

the other direction, and force one to look out for some such explanation, as shall make the writer consistent with himself. A man may fairly say, ‘till I know of other passages in St. Chrysostome, I cannot see my way through this difficulty, viewed as a speculative difficulty: it so happens that he never was an attractive writer to myself; but it would be very unfair in me to say, that difficulties in his writings cannot be explained, merely because hitherto I have not been devout enough to him to obtain a solution of them.’ There are in his writings great difficulties against the doctrine of grace, which have only been gradually explained away. It is certain too, from his book on the priesthood, that he had no scruple about catching souls, by what moderns would call pious frauds<sup>f</sup>. Possibly this, in conjunction with a fuller knowledge of Apollinarianism, against which he appears to be speaking<sup>g</sup>, may enable some future editor to throw light upon the difficulty<sup>h</sup>.

17. Let it not be imagined that such avowals as these are of no use: that they will neither serve to convince others, who are determined to disbelieve it, of our honesty; and may offend the saints, who now clearly see the truths which they then seemed to neglect. For such avowals are of great use to keep ignorant people from rash, sweeping, and general assertions, which when they are found to fail of being

<sup>f</sup> See De Sacerdot. i. fin.

<sup>g</sup> From the mention of the word *Σωλήν* just before in p. 38. e. vol. vii. ed. Ducaeus.

<sup>h</sup> That Montfaucon’s edition is of no great critical value was shewn by me some years ago in the British Critic, vol. xxix. p. 345. &c. and, if I remember right, by Mr. Field, to whose edition of the

Comm. on St. Matthew I have not now access. It is worth adding, that the old Pelagian version of Anianus softens down St. Chrysostome’s expressions, perhaps to make them less unpalatable in the West, but perhaps with a Pelagian object, as will be explained in the Third Part.

true in some one instance, are assumed to be false throughout. It is of the greatest importance in controversy with those without to force them, and indeed ourselves too, to feel that moral truth is not mathematical, that the evidence for the latter is demonstrative, for the former only probable; and therefore always, from its very nature, liable to objections. Those who have been Catholics all their lives have always, as far back as they remember and farther, had the infused light of faith; and it must require in them no small effort to deduct the weight of evidence afforded them by this light, and consider the probable evidence as probable, after this deduction is made. Hence it is useful sometimes to force upon their notice harsh-sounding difficulties, that that charity of theirs which would win others, may be able to arm itself with fitting answers to their difficulties.

18. What I must say of St. Chrysostome, that I must say of the impostor of Areopagus, or rather of Egypt: I have no satisfactory account to give myself of his silence, and therefore do not pretend to satisfy others. Yet as the difficulties in the saint may be diminished by bringing to bear other doctrine of his which shews his leaning, so may the silence of the impostor be in some measure explained by the bias he evinces. It was shewn above then, how the title of Theotocos was a safeguard not only against Nestorianism, but also against Eutychianism. Now the learned Le Quien has made it pretty certain, that the impostor belonged to that school of heresy, which may be called the Apollinarian, or Eutychian<sup>1</sup>. This would make him not very anxious,

<sup>1</sup> Diss. Damasc. ii. §. xiv. xv. chap. 3. Rubeis, Diss. ix. in See above, part i. chap. ix. S. Thom. tries to vindicate the §. 1—7. and below, part iii. genuineness of these works.



(to speak mildly,) of bringing before mankind any thing which forced upon them the fact so unacceptable to that school, that Christ had taken real flesh of a real woman<sup>k</sup>. But if one forger of the fifth or sixth century is worth any thing, then another is. Now Gelasius was a writer somewhat earlier probably than the impostor, and he represents the blessed Virgin as above the heavenly hierarchy in wisdom<sup>l</sup>. But it has been shewn already, and will be shewn more fully in the sequel, that a prominence was given to the Virgin before and after the times of the impostor. Meantime the statement of Hypatius, the worthy Archbishop of Ephesus, that city where Mary's chief title of honour was established, will be read with pleasure by all enemies of forgery: "As for the testimonies of Dionysius, the Areopagite as you call him, (he says,) how can you shew that they are genuine as you suspect? For if they were his, they could not have escaped the blessed Cyril's notice. But why speak of the blessed Cyril, since the blessed Athanasius, if he had known for certain they were his, would have produced these testimonies for a consubstantial Trinity before all the others in the Nicene Council against the blasphemies of Arius<sup>m</sup>." Nobody has ever answered the learned Archbishop's difficulty satisfactorily: the prelate of Ephesus either wounds the impostor, whose silence about the blessed Virgin might be urged against us,

<sup>k</sup> It is worth noticing, that Martin I. and Agatho quote sly passages from Dionysius, Hard. iii. p. 772. e. p. 1099. a. but not, I think, the Greeks in the Sixth General Council. This verifies Gregory the Great's well-known ascription of superior gullibility to the

Latins. 'Nos vestra sicut *non acumina*, ita nec imposturas habemus.' Epist. vi. 14 fin. The Greeks were used to impostures, and so perhaps suspected them more readily in others.

<sup>l</sup> See above, vol. i. p. 269.

<sup>m</sup> Hard. ii. p. 1163. d.



or else makes the Fathers of Nicæa look like an assemblage of ignoramusses. If the latter alternative would be a blasphemous conclusion to come to, let us thank Ephesus for this weapon of defence, furnished us by the former.

19. As for the objection, which may be urged from St. Cyril, I do not pretend that it either is entirely removed, but it seems so materially weakened by the considerations above given, that it is not worth feeling any further anxiety about it. In regard both to him and to St. Austin, it may be said, that when a devotion to the saints is as strongly taught as they have taught it, *and* the blessed Virgin made as much of as they have made of her, it is morally certain that they would have loved any devotion to her. This remark would be true, if their saintship were quite put out of the question. As passages have been already given to shew that St. Austin held that there was a distinction between *Latria* and *Dulia*, it will be well to add one from St. Cyril's work against Julian, to shew that he also was aware of that distinction. It is useful to keep this distinction before the reader for ulterior purposes, as well as for our more immediate one.

20. "We have not made a man God, as you suppose, Julian," (says Cyril,) "nor do we claim to worship one not by nature God: but we worship the Word himself who proceeded from God, him through whom all things were brought into being, who, when he had determined to save the human race, took flesh, and became man, and came forth as man from the holy Virgin. And this he did, that since his divine and unspeakable glory was unapproachable, and could in no way be sustained by us, he might for a certain definite period, like one of ourselves, so far forth as

he appeared as man, associate by an economy with those upon earth, and might persuade us to bethink ourselves who the only God of all is by nature, might by setting forth the science of every virtue, unite us to himself by sanctification and by having benumbed every principedom, every principality, every power that was wicked, and thus set us free from the gods falsely so called. So then the worship we pay is not, as you suppose and say, and claim the right to think, a man-worship : for where is your ground ? but knowing that the Word of God came forth as man, we approach him as God, in so far as he is God, and from God the Father, and is immutable and unalterable ; Moses the allwise having clearly and exactly foretold the mystery concerning him, and the holy prophets also having furnished a prediction concordant with his words. But the holy Martyrs we neither call gods, nor are we wont to worship them, to wit with *Latria*, but only relatively and reverently : but we the rather crown them with the highest reverence, because they have wrestled honourably for the truth, and have so preserved sincerity in faith as to be unsparing even of their life, and to bid adieu to the fear of death, and nobly to triumph over every danger, and set up to mankind, as it were certain images of this marvellous manfulness, their own brave doings. There is nothing unreasonable then, rather doubtless it was even necessary, that those who had such splendid achievements to exult in, should be crowned with unending honours. But that the thing has no fault to be found with it, we shall find even from the more ancient of the Greeks. For in the case of those who had first faced the danger in Marathon in behalf of the whole of Greece, and those who afterwards had fought nobly against the army of Xerxes, it was

a custom with the Athenians to gather themselves together at their graves, and to crown them yearly with encomiums, as men who had undergone a glorious death. How then is it that this brilliant genius cannot leave the duty of honouring the saints alone, without finding fault with it? and yet even Plato himself, writing about those who have chosen to live well and have died no inglorious death, says; ‘For the future we will reverence those who have died thus as men who have become genii, and will worship their graves. The same thing too shall we do when any one, whether by old age or in any other way, shall die of the number of those who have been judged to have led extraordinarily good lives.’ This is what your friend Plato says, my worthy sir. But we, as I was saying, do not say, that the holy Martyrs have become gods, yet are in the habit of counting them worthy of all reverence, and honour their graves, on account of such splendid manfulness, laying before them, as if rewards and restitutions to them, an unfading remembrance<sup>n</sup>.”

21. Now it may fairly be asked, whether if one of the sect called Puseyites, were hardly ever in any single instance to mention Mary without some such epithet as ‘holy,’ or ‘ever-virgin,’ or the like; and then were to profess that he revered the Martyrs just as the pagans did their heroes, except that he did not pay them divine honours: and also were to say, he did not honour them with Latria—whether

<sup>n</sup> Cyril, c. Jul. vi. p. 203-4. The passage of Plato is taken from the Republic, v. §. 15. His idea of the δαιμόνες, here rendered genii, may be seen from the Laws, iv. 6. θεὸς φιλόανθρωπος ὧν ἐφίστη τὸ γένος ἄμεινον

ἡμῶν τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων (and Sympos. §. 28.) ἐρμηνεύον καὶ διαπορθμεύον θεοῖς τὰ παρ’ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, &c. Thus he considered, as best he could, the good would be ‘as the Angels.’

such a one would not justly and rationally be suspected of popery? if he does not practise popish devotions to the Virgin now, (it would be said,) he must be on the high road to it, and perhaps secretly does practise them already. Such a suspicion then may reasonably be entertained of St. Cyril, and of several others, more or less, in the same predicament. Neither Catholic nor protestant would doubt for a moment what was the probable, or rather certain, issue of the publicly admitted premisses of the Puseyite: and neither ought to doubt what Cyril's doctrine would lead him to. If we knew his whole private history, we might see that it had actually led him to 'popish practices' towards the Queen of Heaven.

22. This passage from St. Cyril furnishes a clue to the answer to be given to the strange assertion, that the blessed Virgin was prayed for at the Altar. It is quite one thing to pray for a sinner in the Mass, and quite another thing to commemorate a Martyr. Thus when God is asked to stir up his strength before Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh, the three tribes who carried the relics of Joseph°, then nobody supposes that Ephraim and the other two are prayed for, but that the relics of the Saints draw God's mercies down. Whatever becomes of this interpretation of that particular passage, does not matter: it is only used here to shew, that the unfading commemoration of the saints, alluded to by St. Cyril, may be distinguished from praying for them. Their merits are commemorated in the Mass, not in order to win them any good thereby, but in order to win ourselves their assistance. Supposing you can find

° Ps. lxxx. or lxxix. 2. See 18—22.  
Numb. x. 21—24. 35. and ii.



here and there, as you may, certain difficulties in the way of this rule, still it is the rule, and no new rule either. It is thus explicitly stated by St. Augustine: "The Martyrs are recited in that part of the Mass where we do not pray for them. But for other dead which are commemorated we do pray: for it is wrongful to pray for a Martyr, seeing we ought to commend ourselves to his prayers<sup>p</sup>." So elsewhere he says, "There is a way of life such, as does not require those sacrifices &c.: those which we offer for the very good, are thanksgivings." These positive clear statements of this learned and discriminating Saint, overrule all isolated appearances to the contrary. There is no doubt whatever that he knew perfectly well the feeling of the Church in the matter<sup>q</sup>.

23. It is clear then, that unless you think a protestant clergyman of the eighteenth century a better judge of the feelings and intention of the Church of old than a Catholic bishop of immense learning and acuteness in the fifth century, that there was no intention to pray for the Martyrs, nor consequently for the blessed Virgin, who was, when mentioned at all, mostly, if not invariably, either placed first in the list, or mentioned with some special title of honour<sup>r</sup>. This being so, it is important to make

<sup>p</sup> Serm. 159. §. 1. 172. §. 3. 284. §. 5. 285. §. 5. 297. §. 3. in Jo. tr. 84. §. 1. de Cur. Mort. 6. 19. 20. and above, p. 154. n. o.

<sup>q</sup> Enchir. ad Laur. §. 29. Sec de Anim. et ej. Orig. iii. §. 12. and de Cur. Mort. init.

<sup>r</sup> Renaudot. i. p. 256. Sequitur altera pars quæ est sanctorum commemoratio, nempe non ut pro illis oretur, sed ut

per eorum preces et orationes Deus misereatur supplicantium. Primum vero *apud omnes Ecclesias* nominatur Virgo Maria. Assem. Cod. lit. iv. p. 157. Kraser de Liturg. Occid. p. 495. Gavant. i. p. 389. ed. Venet. state the same of the Roman Missals. The Ethiopic is given by Brett, p. 65. and the Jerusalem in Assem. v. p. 45. and that of St. James, *ibid.* p. 68. and



one or two reflections upon it: the first is, that it is difficult to understand how the whole world fell into such a practice, unless an existing tradition enabled them to do so. Put the date of the actual composition of the Liturgies when you will, they could not have forced upon a reluctant people a doctrine they had not grown up in. Or if they could have succeeded in doing so in some one part of the world, it is ridiculous to suppose that a novel doctrine would have been equally palatable in so many places, and even amongst heretical bodies, such as the Nestorians and Jacobites, (who separated early from the Church<sup>s</sup>;) unless there were in all a tradition to support it<sup>t</sup>. Another remark to be made on this subject is, that no one should confound references to the Liturgies in Fathers and others, with actual statements in the Liturgies themselves. In the case of such reference, the *disciplina arcani* may come in<sup>u</sup>: in the case of the latter, it does not. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says nothing of the blessed Virgin in his notice of the commemorations<sup>v</sup>; but the Jerusalem Missal mentions her. The last remark I shall make on these Missals is, that they let us into the private feeling of Christians, far more than any sermons and didactical pieces were likely to do. The position therefore which they give to the blessed Virgin, is a pretty certain sign of what the secret feelings of early Christians were towards her. And these remarks will tell to a good degree in regard to the Litanies. For though they are much later than the

p.86. p.402,403. and the Alexandrine, ib. vii. part 2. p. 61. p. 63. p. 88. p. 101. Those who have access to Liturgical works may perhaps work this subject out more fully.

<sup>s</sup> See part i. chap. v. §. 1. and 2.

<sup>t</sup> Vide Renaudot. l. c.

<sup>u</sup> See above, chap. xi.

<sup>v</sup> Catech. v. cited by Menard ad Greg. Sacram. n. 39.

Liturgies, still they could not have been introduced at all, unless a strong private devotion had paved the way for them; and as the people at large are so slow in adopting religious feelings of this nature<sup>x</sup>, we may feel sure that what became rife in many places in the eleventh century, must have existed not only at an earlier, but at a very much earlier period among the people.

24. But if you look to evidence of a kind likely to let you still more into the private feelings of early days, such perhaps may possibly occur to those who are versed in early Hagiology. There are two cases which shall be mentioned here, because they are striking in their way, and may give rise to useful reflections. The one is that of S. Mary of Egypt, who obtained her conversion in the fifth or fourth century by prayer before a picture of the blessed Virgin, at which she was miraculously stopped when she had wanted to get into the Church where the newly recovered relic of the Holy Rood was exposed. By applying to the same Virgin, she obtained relief afterwards in her temptations. The whole story is so like what a modern penitent might do, that it is worth considering how a poor harlot came to think of having recourse to Mary, unless even the lewd company she mixed with, knew perfectly well the reverence Catholics paid her<sup>y</sup>. Another instance worth noticing is what occurred to a holy monk in the year 1761. He was informed in a vision, that if he would dig in a certain place, he would discover the body of St. Paulinus, the first bishop of Lucca,

<sup>x</sup> See above, chap. xi. §. 21.

<sup>y</sup> It will be found in the Bollandists, April 2. p. 67. or in Butler, April 9: who in his prosy reflections takes no no-

tice of this marvellous proof of a sacred picture's power. He often reminds me in part of the character of Josephus, given above, p. 5. n. g.

and a disciple of St. Peter's. In order to his success, he was bidden in the vision to assist at a Mass in honour of our Lady, because St. Paulinus had been very devout to her. The vision was confirmed not only by the discovery of the body, but by the miracles it performed when discovered. Those who disbelieve the miracles will do well to consider on how much less certain evidence the miracles of the Apostles rest, and how much more Hume could have said against these than against the former. Yet if the miracles well attested prove the vision to have been from God, it will follow, that God did not think it a false view of early times, which represented the disciples of Apostles as devout to her, whom St. Irenæus calls the advocate of Eve. Failing contemporary evidence, this vision is not uninformative<sup>2</sup>.

\* Boll. ad Jul. xii. p. 265. He is not noticed in Butler.

## CHAP. XIII.

OF THE EVIDENCE OF VISIONS, MIRACLES, AND ALLEGORY.

1. WHEN the Apostles seemed to speak with diverse tongues to a multitude of Jews from all parts of the world, St. Peter quotes a text, which will not prove that the gift of tongues was foretold, but does prove that the Christian dispensation was to be a miraculous one. The prophecy he quotes instances visions and dreams, as what were to be common under such a dispensation : and the argument he seems to expect people to frame to themselves is something of this kind : a dispensation to which visions and dreams are promised is a miraculous dispensation : any kind of miracles may be expected under such a dispensation : therefore, the gift of being able to make the impression of several languages at once by one speaking may be expected<sup>a</sup>.

2. If this were so, either the prophecy never had a literal fulfilment, or if it had, it was not then, but at some other time. The name, the 'last days,' seems naturally to include the whole time of the Christian dispensation, especially the later parts of that time, which give the whole time its sole right to such an appellation. Now as occasion has been taken already, and may be taken hereafter in this work, to mention such visions, it is desirable to say something here

<sup>a</sup> See Butler's Anal. part ii. chap. 1. where the handling of, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' suggested this reasoning.

about the use of them. As moreover miracles and allegory afford evidence of a similar nature to that afforded by visions, they may fairly be treated of in the same chapter. No one of them constitutes to a Catholic the ground upon which he would believe a thing to be an article of faith: yet they confirm doctrine, known from other sources even to a Catholic: and one does not see why to a person incapable of faith because out of the Church, they should not constitute the reason, why he comes into the Church. All moral evidence has a certain amount of uncertainty prior to the gift of faith; yet it is enough to induce us to come to the Church for that faith: why should this not be the case with miracles, or visions, or allegory?

3. In order to give the reader a brief sketch of the nature of this evidence, let us consider first the proof there is of the existence of a belief in visions in early ages. That they are promised in prophecy is unquestionable: that the Church Catholic of this day believes in the existence and likelihood of such things, is proved by the existence of a science for distinguishing real from false visions. That they were believed to exist in earlier days, and were used then to confirm doctrines already known, may be useful to shew by a few instances. It must not be supposed that they are all that could be found, or that this is any thing more than a rude outline of a subject, in itself sufficiently vast to yield matter for volumes. Neither may it be altogether easy to state in what the essence of vision consists, at least not to state it in such manner as to be intelligible to several classes of religionists in this country. St. Paul, according to St. Augustine, was so ravished, had the intention of his mind so utterly turned off from the



senses of this life, as not to know whether he was in the body or no. This, he says, *is usual* in more intense kinds of ecstasy. In so saying, of course he implies, that in his day visions were not looked upon as things which had ceased with the Apostles<sup>b</sup>. He expresses a belief that his mother had had visions<sup>c</sup>. He mentions more than once the vision St. Perpetua had of Purgatory, and of her praying her brother's soul out of it<sup>d</sup>; to say nothing of several other things of the same kind which he notices.

4. His great contemporary, St. Cyril, in writing to St. Leo about fixing the time of Easter, an office entrusted to the Alexandrian Church from its facilities for astronomy, uses the following story in confirmation of what he had said. 'I will shew you, that Pachomius, a man remarkable for his actions, noted for Apostolic grace, and the founder of the Cenobia of Egypt, sent a letter to the monastery called, in the language of the Egyptians, Panum, which letter he had gained from an Angel's dictation, in order that they might not run into error about the calculation of the Paschal solemnity<sup>e</sup>.' And the Synod of Ephesus, of which Cyril acted as head, writing to St. Dalmatius, a monk of the day, celebrated for his holiness, expresses their belief in a similar gift. 'We beseech you . . . to supply our place in the emergencies relating to the faith here: for we know, that even before Nestorius came to Constantinople, God revealed to you the things in his heart; and you said to every one that came in your cell, Take heed to yourselves, brethren, for an evil beast sojourns in this city, and will be able to hurt many by his

<sup>b</sup> Epist. 147. §. 31.

iii. §. 12. iv. §. 26.

<sup>c</sup> Conf. iii. §. 19.

<sup>e</sup> Ap. Leo, vol. i. p. 603.

<sup>d</sup> De Anim. et ej. Or. i. §. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Hard. i. p. 1448. c.

doctrine<sup>f</sup>.” Here a whole host of prelates, with Cyril at their head, express their belief in a vision or prophecy, and ground their desire of Dalmatius’s assistance upon that belief. And again, when Julian derides Christians for not having these gifts any longer, Cyril replies: “That after Christ himself came among us and appeared upon earth, the grace of the ancient prophecy went by default: but even now God, according to his good pleasure, echoes in the saints things to come, and haunts holy souls with the sound of them. Let him therefore cease to say that the Spirit has failed<sup>g</sup>.”

5. St. John Chrysostome, in speaking of the Real Presence, adduces the following vision in support of his assertions. “When the priest invokes the Holy Spirit, and is finishing that most awful sacrifice, and is continually touching the common Lord of all, in what rank shall we place him, tell me, and what purity shall we not require of him, what reverence? for consider what hands they ought to be that minister such things, what a tongue that should be that pours forth those words, what ought to be so pure and holy as the soul that receives so great a Spirit! Because at that time the angels stand by the priest, and the whole host of heavenly powers exults, and the place about the altar fills with them to do honour to him that lies there. And of this the rites there celebrated are in themselves enough to persuade one. But I have heard a certain person

<sup>f</sup> Hard. i. p. 1448. c.

<sup>g</sup> c. Julian. vi. p. 199. E. For some justification of the rendering of *ἐναυλιζέται*, ‘haunts with sound,’ see Timæus Lex. Plat. v. *ἐναυλος λόγος*, and Gram. ap. Bekk. p. 252. in v. who

both explain by *ἐνηχος*, the word Cyril uses just before. Cyril uses it elsewhere of mere indwelling, but the context makes it probable, that Plato’s word was before his mind.

relate how an eld, a wondrous man, and *used to see* revelations, told him, that he had been once honoured with a revelation to this effect, and at that time had suddenly seen a multitude of angels, in such way as was possible for him, girt about with bright vests, and circling round the altar, and bowing down, in the way one sees soldiers standing when the king is there. This I, for my part, believe. And another told me not from hearsay, but having been himself privileged to see and to hear it, that, in the case of those who are about to depart hence, if they have partaken of the mysteries in a clear conscience, when they are on the point of expiring, the angels, for the sake of that which they have received, form a body guard to them, and conduct them from this world<sup>h</sup>.”

6. The story of our Lady's apparition with St. John to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus has been alluded to already, and is too well known to need detailing here. But it is to be observed, that St. Gregory Nyssen, who retails it, was acute and learned enough to detect any dissonance from the feelings and principles of the Church, had this been implied by a belief in any thing of the kind. St. Athanasius, who next to St. Augustine was perhaps the most original Christian writer that ever lived, has left us a life of St. Antony, which was translated before St. Jerome's time into Latin, and probably also into Syriac<sup>i</sup>, since it appears that St. Ephrem knew it. In this life the following rules are given by St. Antony

<sup>h</sup> De Sacerd. lib. vi. vol. iv. p. 83. Comp. de Incompr. iii. v. fin. and Ambros. in Luc. i. 11. “Angelus videtur in templo, quia veri Sacerdotis

jam nunciabatur adventus, et celeste Sacrificium *parabatur* in quo Angeli ministrabant.”

<sup>i</sup> This translation still remains. See Montf. pref. p. 627.

for distinguishing spirits: "The inroad and appearance of wicked spirits is confused, with noise, and sound, and outcry; much as the stir made by the young, and the uneducated, and robbers: whereof springeth forthwith a cowardice of soul, and confusion and disorder of thoughts, dejection, hatred towards ascetics, tepidity, sorrow, recollection of relations, and fear of death; and moreover, a lust for evil things, negligence about the affairs of virtue, and an unsettled state of mind. When therefore after seeing certain things you are afraid, if the fear be forthwith removed, and in its place there comes joy unutterable, and hopefulness, and courage, and refreshment, and a quietness of thoughts, and all the other symptoms I told you of before, and manliness and love towards God; then cheer up and pray: for the joy and the quiet of the soul shews the holiness of him who is present. Thus Abraham, when he saw the Lord, rejoiced: thus John too, when the voice came from Mary Mother of God, leapt for joy<sup>k</sup>." How God and Mary come to occur to the great ascetic's mind as *the* specimens of the approach of good spirits, protestants may decide: but it is important to observe, that these rules in St. Antony are the result not so much of acquired, as of infused, wisdom, for he never learnt letters<sup>l</sup>. Still he assumes the existence of such things, and gives rules about them, and himself had visions<sup>m</sup>.

7. The same also may be inferred to have been the case at a much earlier period in Egypt. For Origen writes as follows, though in his words I

<sup>k</sup> Vit. Anton. §. 36. St. Ignatius seems to borrow from hence some of his rules for discerning spirits.

<sup>l</sup> Athan. *ibid.* init.

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.* §. 38—40. §. 49. §. 82. §. 86.



have altered a name or two, as it will be seen : “ There are still preserved amongst Christians traces of that holy Spirit, who was seen in the form of a dove. They charm away demons, and effect many cures, and according to the will of the Word see certain things which are to come. Even if Hume, or Tillotson whom he quotes, mean to make mirth of what I am going to say, still say it I will : to wit, that many, as if against their will, have come over to Catholicism, a certain Spirit having suddenly turned their conscience from hating the faith to suffering the loss of all for it, and having given them visions, either openly or in a dream. For we have come to know several cases of this kind, which if we were to write down, even though we ourselves had met with the persons and seen them, we should be laughed to scorn by protestants, who suppose that we ourselves put things of this sort together just as those do, whom they suspect of putting things of the kind together<sup>n</sup>.” And presently after he says, “ We, as far as we can, shall make good our assertion by saying this : as it is believed that many have been shewn, when waking, visions, some of which were of a diviner sort, and some related to future things of this life, either clearly or enigmatically expressed, as indeed is obvious to all who admit a providence ; so that there is nothing incongruous in supposing, that the same ruling faculty which in a dream puts forms before us, should also for the benefit of him into whom they are put, put them before us when waking.” Here he is reasoning scientifically upon vision, and defending the prophets upon principles equally applicable to all visionaries. Celsus, like modern unbelievers, attacks, and requires

<sup>n</sup> c. Cels. i. p. 34-5. Spens.



answering upon principles applicable to both. And Irenæus states, that visions, foreknowledge of things to come, and prophetic declarations, and gifts of healing, were in existence in his day°. It is unnecessary to remind the reader, that Hermes, an apostolic man, left some visions behind him.

8. I know that dreams and visions appear absurd to certain people, but then it is to those who would rather believe any thing against a priest, than believe a priest: this is not to be wondered at, seeing Joseph's brethren said of him, 'See, this dreamer is coming; come now, and let us kill him:' yet the dreamer obtained what he dreamt of, and his killers and sellers were brought to shame. So, as they would not believe words before, they had to believe realities after<sup>p</sup>." St. Cyprian applies this principle to himself, when he says; "Divine justice ceaseth not to chastise us day or night. For besides visions of the night, by day also children of an innocent age are filled among us with the Holy Spirit, and in ecstasy see with their eyes, and hear and speak such things as the Lord deigneth to admonish and instruct us withal<sup>q</sup>." And in his book on the plague, he mentions a vision of a youth of majestic bearing, tall, and so bright, that human eyes could scarcely bear to behold him, and saying indignantly, 'You are afraid to suffer on; and you are unwilling to depart. What am I to do for you<sup>r</sup>?' This the saint uses to edify his flock; observing, that it was of no use to the man himself who saw it, as he died directly after.

9. Other instances of a similar kind might easily

° Lib. ii. cap. 32. §. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Cyprian, ep. 69. §. 10. the inverted commas have been purposely omitted at the be-

ginning of this paragraph.

<sup>q</sup> Ep. ix. §. 4.

<sup>r</sup> Cap. xix.

be found, but these are enough for our present purpose. Let us make a few reflections upon them. It is quite plain that the belief in the existence of visions was in being in different parts of the Church of the five first centuries. It would be easy to shew from St. Gregory's dialogues, that that belief was part and parcel of the Christianity he sent over into England: or from St. Bede's histories, that he succeeded in conveying that belief hither. The protestant notion, on the contrary, is, that at some time or other Joel's prophecy ceased, if the expression may be allowed, to be in operation. This is not the Church's idea on the subject: every age has had its visions: the earliest began making rules for the right use of them. And though they are not to be expected in the case of persons who are ordinary, or think themselves extraordinary, Christians; yet it is supposed in the Church, that the last days have not gone yet, nor consequently visions which are given at times according to the 'will of the Word.' Now, as the Fathers did pay respect to such things, it is morally certain that they would not have made the numberless and well-attested visions relating to the blessed Virgin go for nothing. If Joel the prophet came upon earth in search of the Christian religion which he had foretold, knowing nothing of the Fathers, and fully intending to go by the Bible only, which would he choose, the Church in which visions and dreams are 'not at home,' or, that where the whole etiquette of them, so to speak, is a thing perfectly known and recognised by the learned? If he knocked at the cell of St. Antony, or of St. Ignatius, both would tell him pretty much the same story, and in pretty near the same words. The spiritual men of the time either of the first or last general council,

would be agreed that visions there were in the Church at times, that the devil was well aware of that fact, and tried to turn it to account by puffing up novices through false visions, or inducing Celsus, Julian, Hume, and many others essentially of the same school, to make game of the whole thing altogether.

10. The question then next to be considered is, *what* weight visions are to have, how much is to be given to them, in proving or confirming doctrine? To this it may be considered, that they are to have a similar weight to the opinion of a Father of the Church. Of course, upon all ruled points there can be no doubt whatever, that the decree of the Church settles the matter for ever with all Catholics. Even protestants are aware of this. But the question, what weight is to be attached to visions, as proving or confirming doctrines, can only be asked in regard to points that are not yet ruled. Now it does seem that if a number of saintly persons, not one or two, but a number of them, all have the same impression made upon them in times of supernatural intercourse with God, that that impression must go for a very great deal. If only one or two have it, then the amount of sanctity and illumination ordinarily evinced by them, must measure the amount of value to be attached to their vision. Or, it might be measured by their devotion to a special mystery, just as a man would more easily set aside an opinion of St. Chrysostome upon grace, than one of St. Austin, or of St. Basil on the Incarnation, than one of St. Cyril. But in all respects the analogy, not the sameness but the analogy between the two, will be found to hold. As one Father does not tell against the others, and does not tell much without some others, but with many or with all tells very much indeed, so one

visionary is of more or less weight in ascertaining what the feeling of the Church is on any point in proportion to the numbers of the others with whom he coincides.

11. This way of putting the matter, of course, presupposes that the mind of the Church is ascertainable from other sources: and that all that either visions or Fathers do, is to add, each in their degree, something to that evidence which makes the Church disposed to rule a thing one way, and not another. It seems to be an utterly absurd impatience of the uncertainty attaching to all moral evidence to make *no* account of visions, miracles, or allegories, simply and solely because they alone and by themselves do not force a thing into a state of 'de fide,' which was not in that state before. Again, to suppose that the recorders of several such revelations can all have strayed unconsciously into the same consistent view of any matter at issue, seems so entirely identical with the protestant notion, that all the Liturgies and Fathers of the whole world bungled into one coherent system, that it savours more or less of blaspheming the Holy Ghost, rather than acknowledge his working. Perhaps then it may be allowed to assume, that if there are saints, there are visions; and if visions, mistakes and divergencies in isolated cases; and if mistakes of this kind, then points of agreement, which no Christian mind can think a sort of evidence he can comfortably set aside.

12. Whatever then really might be claimed for visions, all that is claimed for them here is something of the same sort of authority as we give to Fathers: the amount of this varies in the way indicated above. It should however be remembered, that as in Scripture so in Fathers, as in Fathers so in visions, there



may be many apparent contradictions which are not real ones: the same saint at different times, or different saints at the same time, may take a portrait of our Lord or our Lady in different parts of their life, or in different stages of the same transaction. Hence a man well-read in theology could not presume, without careful consideration and attempts at adjustment, to decide that an actual contradiction was in any given case asserted: and a man who attempted without such knowledge of theology to lay down the law in such a matter, must be too conceited to judge rightly of the actions of saints. As in Fathers and Scripture such apparent contradictions lead us on to a fuller and deeper appreciation of the doctrine concerned, so may it be in visions also.

13. It is an objection to the whole thing here intended that may be raised, that they were and are chiefly given to women, though of course not solely, in such cases as they have been detailed and written visions or revelations. The names of Bridgett, Hildegard, Catharine, Theresa, Gertrude, Mary Magdalene dei Pazzi, Maria d'Agreda, Emerich, are all names of female saints, remarkable for visions. And it will be thought by some, that the weaker sex is more liable to delusion, and therefore that things of this sort can be good for very little. But the analogy of nature suggests a ready answer to difficulties of this sort. Christianity has infused into the ordinary course of things a feeling of courtesy towards women, which differs in its modes of exhibiting itself, from courtesy as displayed towards men, unsanctified as both may often be. Herein the provisions of Christianity meet, and tally with the difference which nature makes between the two. Now as nature means nothing else but the course of things God



has appointed, why should not God himself have a different way of dealing with those whom he has originally made to differ, adapting, by a kind of divine courtesy, his converse with female saints to the natures he has given them? But perhaps if facts could always be got at, the difficulty here supposed to exist might really exist in name only.

14. From this it will follow, that if writers upon the blessed Virgin do appeal to visions and revelations as confirming what they say, not as simply proving it by themselves, and without the Church's teaching—such writers may yet be not raving idly, but talking good sense. Holy Scripture leads us to expect visions, and warns us against following them, *when* they gainsay the teaching of the Church<sup>a</sup>; but where does it teach us that they are absurd, worthless, and not to be expected as among the Jews? Discernment of spirits is a gift which God does not give out of the Church, because it would be of no use. Indeed our Lord supposes, that gifts of this nature will be so common in the Church, that the possession of them would yield a popular excuse for not having done good works in the last day. '*Many* shall say to me in that day, In thy name have we cast out devils, and in thy name done *many* miracles, or wonderful works<sup>t</sup>.'

15. What was said above may be said here, that an abuse implies a use. If God fulfills his promise, and gives visions in the Church, a use of them there must be: if visions apparently contradictory may be reconciled with each other, no vision whatever that is well attested ought to be made light of. It would seem the wise course to suspend the judgment about it till we are better informed, and to consider whether

<sup>a</sup> Deut. xiii. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Matt. vii. 22.

it is analogous to accredited visions, and in conformity with the doctrine of the Church. How easy it would be to make sport of a clay-toed, brass-bellied, silver-armed, golden-headed monster, seen in a dream by a pagan Monarch<sup>u</sup>! A sober-minded Jewish theologian of the day no doubt would have laughed at such a vision as unworthy of God, and not worth troubling his head about. Yet it was a most eventful vision from Almighty God. Consequently things, seemingly not at all fitted for the purpose, may be used by Almighty God as a vehicle for the knowledge he intends to convey; and it is possible that a vision, apparently without much analogy to support it, may be true. Hence a vision, which, though single-handed, yet has much to support it in the teaching of the Church, has a much greater chance of being true.

16. It may be urged, that if this be so, revelation is not a thing given once for all to the Saints, but a progressive, and improving, and continuous disclosure of God's will. Now supposing this were asserted, it would not be claiming more for the Christian than is accorded to the Jewish Church. It would be exceedingly hard to say of any prophecy of the Old Testament, that it was not contained in the Law, contained in such way, that by the application of the memory and understanding to the law, it might be evolved from the law. David, '*the* prophet,' as the Greek Fathers usually style him, is continually alluding to his meditation upon the Law. Who can say, whether David's conception of Melchizedek resulted from such meditation? who can define the point, where ordinary inspiration ends, and that, more technically so called, begins? It is obvious to reply, 'the

<sup>u</sup> Dan. ii. 3.

Church can :’ but if you go by the Church, we can wish nothing farther : the matter is settled at once. For if the Church really is your rule, her deductions from Scripture, and Fathers, and tradition will be accepted by you. She can tell you, whether the deductions made in the visions of the Saints are or are not in accordance with her teaching.

17. But there is no need to contend that visions add any thing to what is already revealed. So far from this being claimed, it is impossible to say, whether the teaching does not originate the matter of the vision in almost all cases. Thus when the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was revealed to St. Bridgett in a vision, it was not the vision which then for the first time put the doctrine into her mind, but the Church had put it there first, by allowing the pious opinion, and the vision *confirmed* it. This is analogous to what happens in ordinary cases : a man might be in doubt, whether he had gotten hold of the Church’s mind upon some particular point. He might make a Communion in order to gain light upon the subject, and come from it with a distincter impression about the subject. All seasons of special intercourse with God are opportunities for gaining light of this kind. They confirm a person as to the doctrine he learnt from other sources. A vision, which is a rare and supernatural favour, acts in the same direction, but in a more decided and peremptory and authoritative tone. Nevertheless, all it does is to elicit from premisses already taught by revelation, a conclusion already taught or encouraged by the Church. It seems then idle to try to elude that particular force which visions have, upon the ground that to allow them any force, would be to make a new revelation.

For faith comes by hearing, that is, through the senses, or by the help of experimental knowledge; not to be sure without the accompaniment of an internal divine gift. Still God in a vision may bring before the soul the same conclusions by a separate and altogether distinct kind of knowledge \*.

18. What has been here said of visions, may also be said of miracles: they do not teach any new revelation, but when men are 'fools, and slow of heart to believe' what has already been revealed, they force this upon their notice. Nine-tenths of Christians would have the vividness of their faith in the Incarnation increased by any miracle which confirmed that doctrine; that is, they are capable of having a new kind of knowledge added to faith, added to the one perfect in its kind, which we may suppose them to have already. But it seems next to certain, that those who defy the miracles which prove the duty of worshipping Mary by neglecting to enquire into them, would never have become Christians, had they lived in early days: they would have shut their eyes to evidence of the Apostles' miracles, when they heard others talk of them, and not have had earnestness of mind enough to enquire into that evidence, which, if true, would have obliged them to a change of life: or they would have eluded its application to themselves by some half-believed sophism. As any one can, if he pleases, find whether God has done miracles in support of the worship of Mary, it is needless to say more of them here†. What was said of visions, may be said of them: they are not ordinary things, nor, if taken

\* See part i. chap. 15.

Madonna, beginning with the

† The series of Articles in the Rambler on Sanctuaries of the

No. for Septemb. A.D. 1850, may be referred to for this purpose.



singly, of cogent weight perhaps; but when a number of them concur in one conclusion, it is to be feared men may account more easily in this world to themselves, than in the next to Almighty God for their scornful neglect of them.

19. Similar reflections might easily be made upon the uses of allegory. Observations upon this subject have been scattered up and down this work already: but as a turn for allegorical interpretation is one of the signs by which we may learn whether any given Father is likely to favour devotion to the Virgin, and as this sort of interpretation is supposed to be, and often really is, open to the charge of fancifulness, it is desirable to make a few observations upon it in this place.

20. The principles already laid down, to keep the use of visions within bounds, will apply in a good measure to allegories. That allegorical interpretation of any given passage which the Church sanctions, or the Fathers in diverse parts of the world agree upon, or the generality of divines admit, ought to be of some weight even in argument. An instance of the former is to be found in the type of the burning bush, which the Church applies in one of the antiphons for the Circumcision to our Lady. An instance of the second is to be found in the interpretation, which takes the eastern gate mentioned in Ezekiel, of the miraculous birth of our Saviour. An instance of the latter is supplied by the application of our Lord's words about Lazarus, 'Loose him, and let him go,' to the sacrament of Penance<sup>z</sup>. But under the second head come many cases, where the interpretation is far from appearing

<sup>z</sup> See Bellarmin. de Sacr. loc. Jo. xi. p. 424.  
Pœn. iii. cap. 3. A Lapide in



so apposite, when once stated. Thus the words of the Psalm, ‘*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*,’ are used by most Anti-arian writers of antiquity, as an allegorical expression for the Generation of the Son. The heart represents the Bosom of the Father, the good Word the Son<sup>a</sup>. *Some* go further, and take the words, ‘*My tongue is the pen &c.*’ of God writing on the fleshly tables of the heart, with the Holy Ghost, appearing like tongues of fire<sup>b</sup>. And this seems nothing more than following out the principles already applied by nearly *all*, to the first verse.

21. Now it may be said, ‘this was only in the taste of the day, that it was a mode of interpreting, borrowed from Pagans or Jews: but it is unbecoming an enlightened mind.’ If, however, you assign either of these sources, you will leave the matter where it was. The Targums, and more ancient commentaries of the Jews, abound in interpretations of this sort. If these were unadvisable and injudicious, and so open to abuse as to be incapable of legitimate use, why did St. Paul adopt them? why does he give countenance to a system already in existence, when by so doing he must have known, that he would lead others to do the same, and that much more effectually, than if he had used occasionally some original style of argument, which did not come out of any already existing system? St. Austin has somewhere said,

<sup>a</sup> Lorinus in loc. p. 856. Placent hi sensus, ac præsertim qui de Christo est, sive (ceus?) de quo Pater loquitur; sed ita ut mystici habeantur: quamvis quia tot adeoque graves Patres eum tradunt, et

propemodum communis est, et ex Patribus non pauci usurpant in *disputationibus* contra Judæos et hæreticos; liceat et nobis inde ducere probabile *saltem* argumentum.

<sup>b</sup> See *ibid.* p. 869.

that the Apostle does not say, 'Let not us have a Sunday dinner, as some of them also had;' but, 'Let not us commit fornication, as some of them also committed'. The old wives' fables of the Jews the Apostle may find fault with, but not with their allegorical interpretation: the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in Moses' seat are not reprov'd for using allegorical interpretation, but for their works. Yet Christ knew that his Church would adopt this system, not merely for devotional, but even for polemical, purposes. It will not mend matters then to say, this was a fanciful method of interpretation, borrowed from the Jews.

22. Neither does it seem very rational to account for its adoption, by supposing that it was taken from the pagans of the day. If any one Father, St. Augustine, for instance, had been the only person who adopted it, then those who like to prune down and narrow as much as possible the limits of St. Augustine's authority, might say it was 'the infirmity of a great mind' to have adopted such an imaginative system. But are Hilary, Athanasius, Nyssen, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyril, Gregory the Great, and every body to be infirm of mind, who adopted this system? 'That which cannot be abused is good for nothing,' said the great Niebuhr. Now it does seem true, that the heathen early adopted the plan of explaining the lewd passages of their poets by allegory<sup>d</sup>. But it does not seem true, that this suggested to the Christian Church throughout the world the notion of finding a deeper meaning beneath the letter

<sup>c</sup> Epist. xxxvi. §. 15. Neque prandemus sabbato, sicut et illi pranderunt, &c.

<sup>d</sup> Vide Gräfenhan Gesch.

der Klass. Literatur, 1. p 215. Creuzer ad Cic. de Nat. D. 1. 15. n. 5.

of the historical parts both of the Old and New Testament. On the contrary, the Divine<sup>e</sup> acutely points to this distinction between the two systems. The heathens put forward prominently what would contaminate and demoralize, and then subsequent commentators save the credit of their great men by taking refuge in allegorical expositions. The Christian Scriptures, on the contrary, put forward for the most part, or indeed almost exclusively, things honest, and useful as examples, and behind them afterwards the commentators discover a hidden and deeper meaning. The heathen writers, who found in the harmless prologues to Plato's dialogues<sup>f</sup> wonderful allegorical meanings, seem to have borrowed this idea from Christians. This then would be not original in them: the idea of applying allegory to explain away the impurities of the gods was original. It is just possible, that where the Fathers explain the occasional appearances of misconduct in the patriarchs by the allegorical principle, that this may have been suggested to them by the heathen use of allegory. But it is so natural, when the sum total of a man's life is saintly, to look out for some means of explaining seeming irregularities in that life, that it cannot be taken for granted, that even as much as this was borrowed from the heathen use of allegory. It is more probable that allegory was looked upon by them as a universal solvent for all difficulties: and was applied to these as well as to other difficult cases.

23. The two suppositions then, that allegorical interpretation came from the Jews: and that it came

\* Gregor. Naz. c. Jul. iii. ad Timæum init. or ad Parmenidam init.  
p. 106.

<sup>f</sup> See, for example, Proclus

from the heathen, may be set aside. If it was wrong to adopt it from the Jews, it was wrong in our Lord not to put us on our guard against it, and not to preserve his Apostle St. Paul from it. If you say it came from the heathen, you will be bound to shew clearly a real similarity in the two systems, and also to account for the fact, that the Church's greatest writers ever adopted it, or gave their sanction to it. Moreover it is to be observed, that our Lord quotes the writings of Jonas as a prophet. Now it does not seem that without allegory Jonas has any claim whatever to be placed among the prophets. If a sensible modern had the sorting of the canon, he would have put Jonas with Esther, and other historical books. The Jews, however, divide their canons of the Old Testament into Law, Prophets, and Psalms. This division our Lord gives his sanction to by using it<sup>g</sup>. But among the Prophets they place the historical books of Joshua, Judges, and Kings, calling these the former, and Isaias and the rest the latter, Prophets. This again looks very much as if it was the *intention* of Almighty God that there should be allegorical interpretation in his Church. For why sanction a division which has no meaning, unless the historical books are allegorical?

24. Again, it is a fact not to be denied, that there are some minds capable of being impressed with a truth by means of such interpretation. Not only are children taught by fables, but prophets and visionaries under the Old and New Testament have been taught by similitudes of this kind<sup>h</sup>. There are some truths, apparently of the greatest consequence, no where taught in Scripture, perhaps, except in

<sup>g</sup> Luke xxv. 44.

visions of Hermas, or St. Mary

<sup>h</sup> See Osee xii. 10. and the M. dei Pazzi.



allegorical language. Thus when people wish to prove, that there is no possibility of meriting after this life, they quote the text, ‘In whatsoever place the tree shall fall, there it shall lie;’ which certainly might mean many other things, and does not either in itself or in its context force this meaning upon us. Yet when the truth here taught has been once put into our minds, this text wears the appearance of being a scriptural sanction for it. Why should it be absurd to say, that falling to the south means dying a good death, and falling to the north dying a bad death<sup>1</sup>? as St. Jerome and others have done.

25. The reason why men in general take up with the interpretation of one part of the verse, and think the other fanciful, seems to be this: Tradition has put the one before them, not the other. There is no more intrinsic fancifulness in one part of the interpretation than in the other: only as the dreams of the good take a colour from their previous waking thoughts, so do the vague ramblings of protestant theology retain dim impressions of ancient tradition. Again, when Catholics quote the text, ‘My dove is one’ to prove the unity of the Church<sup>k</sup>; there is no text which in direct and unallegorical language states the same truth so forcibly. The Church is described oftenest in language of this nature, as Jerusalem, as a city set on a hill, as a pillar and ground of the truth, but perhaps never without somewhat of the allegorical. Yet this is the fundamental doctrine upon which all others rest.

26. It is the tradition of the Church then that, as matter of fact, brings before us the meaning of the most important allegories<sup>l</sup>. Whatever there is that

<sup>1</sup> Eccles. xi. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Cant. vi. 8.

<sup>l</sup> Bellarm. de Missâ, v. cap. 6. p. 383. Ex figuris dogmata



is really fanciful or apparently divergent in the interpretations of individual allegorists, must be measured; harmonized, or retrenched, by reference to the sense of the Church, both as to the doctrine so evolved from the passages, and as to the particular application of the passages themselves to that doctrine. The chief, if not the only danger worth apprehending from such interpretations is, the danger of persons attempting, as Origen did, to elicit new doctrines from Scripture by means of them. But here it is contended, that they can only be used to prove that doctrine, which the Church previously and independently believes. If she has a doctrine given her by tradition which will explain an allegorical passage clearly, then some sort of confirmation is given to that doctrine by the very fact of the allegory being explained. If a key ever so wonderfully made were put into my hands, I should not feel the same proof of design upon the maker's part from the mere look of the key, as I should from the fact of its fitting exactly to some lock of equally intricate construction. If a person told me he felt no fresh confirmation of the doctrine of our Lady's miraculous Parturition, from the fact, that it so thoroughly explains the allegory in Ezekiel, all I could say is, that I am utterly unable to enter into his state of mind. I am not asserting, that his faith, which is an infused gift, would be increased; but that his tangible and producible evidence for a certain doctrine would seem to me to be increased.

fabricari possunt, quando ex Scripturis, juxta communem sensum patrum intellectis, colligitur explicatio. Non enim necesse est ut semper scriptura apertissime loquatur, sed satis

est si ita loquatur, ut communem patrum interpretationem secuti, sententiam ejus assequamur: *alioquin* paucissima ac fere nulla essent dogmata Ecclesiæ.

27. Now the Church does not make things articles of faith, without some tangible and producible evidence. This evidence is never of a demonstrative kind: it is moral or probable evidence: it admits of degrees. The question then is, does the power of any doctrine to explain a series of allegorical passages add any degree of evidence to that doctrine? By doctrine here is not meant a dogma, an article of faith, a thing necessarily to be believed, but something tending to become so; of which the Church is disposed to make an article of faith, if upon consideration she can find sufficient tangible proof for it. Let us see if the unlocking of an allegory would help to supply this kind of proof. Now once on a time there were a large number of different Gospels: imagine the Church disposed to select *four* of them, and make it 'de fide' to believe in these four. Upon considering, she finds there is a passage in Ezekiel which speaks of *four* living creatures; that there is a tradition that these mean the four Evangelists; that though there is some, and indeed great discrepancy, as to which Evangelist is meant by each living creature, still that on the whole the assumption of four, and no more, gives an intelligible scope for the allegory. If from this the Church helped herself in concluding that there were but four Evangelists, and put aside all whose claims on other grounds were not as great as those of the present four, would any one say this was an irrational mode of coming at God's mind or intention in the matter? Whether or no the Church did not in fact settle questions of this sort another way, it is of no consequence to enquire: the case, even if it were purely hypothetical, would serve to shew, that the power of unlocking an allegory might help the

Church in coming to a decision about the doctrine unlocked.

28. This way of stating the case supposes nothing more than this, that the tangible proof for a doctrine is variable, admits of degrees, admits of increase. The question, whether the Church always held a doctrine, is the same as the question, whether God always taught and intended it to be taught in his Church. Innumerable difficulties may have to be surmounted, before this matter of fact can be made sufficiently credible in some cases. But if God shews by a series of visions and of miracles that he approves the doctrine now, and by its power to explain a series of allegories, that he had it in his mind to reveal it from the first, why then, in the language of the poet, ‘the very least of all these signs were probable.’ Supposing God’s intentions not to be quite certain, we must come at them by probable proofs, drawn from facts within our reach, and from documents which we can examine and apply our facts to. It does not appear why evidence of this kind, viz. the concurrent testimony of many miracles, visions, and allegories, may not come in to shew the present will and past intention of Almighty God.

29. It has been the object of this chapter to bring to the reader’s knowledge the existence of certain supernatural facts, and the mode of applying them to the documents we have. To deny the existence of miracles and visions, merely because there *are* counterfeit ones, would have kept almost all St. Paul’s disciples out of the Church. To own their existence, and yet not to admit the divinity of that body which has the sole possession of them, is a mode of acting which can best be summed up in Medea’s

well-known words: 'Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor.' No other tangible and producible ground for believing Christianity at all, can be assigned but miracles and prophecy, and the latter includes allegorical writings. The God who proved his own coming in the flesh by these, by these has also proved his respect for the Woman from whom he took that flesh.

30. The second portion of this Work then may be considered to have been brought to a close. Let the reader now seriously consider, whether it has not been fairly shewn, that the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation naturally leads to the reverence shewn by the Church for the blessed Virgin. What is meant here is, that the latter is perfectly *consistent* with the former. If you are not satisfied with the proofs for the former, still you may be able to see that the latter is consistent with it, as perfectly consistent as can be expected upon a subject of a moral, and not a mathematical, nature. And it may be doubted whether a man, who was tempted to disbelieve the very first principles even of a mathematical science, would not feel a reassurance of their truth from reflecting upon the consistency of the superstructure. If God took flesh with a reasonable soul, it is to be expected he should illuminate that soul: if he took it not from the earth, but from a woman, it was to be expected he should reverence that woman: if he was with her for thirty years, it was to be expected she would gain and retain habits of influence with him. If exceptions can be raised to the instances in which the exercise of that influence has been here alleged, so they can to other Christian doctrines. Some exceptions of this kind have been brought forward; and a full answer to

them, considered as practical difficulties, has been given.

31. Let a person, who is not satisfied with this reasoning, imagine himself with Magdalene and with John beneath the cross, fall down, and adore his Redeemer, and see if there be any one in that company against whose presence there he can assign any reason, which he will not be ashamed to utter to the bleeding Son of Mary! Excellent reasoning has sometimes failed to convince infidels: this shews that something else was wanting. Let others take care, that they also do not neglect to use the proper means of obtaining the *will* to be convinced.



PART THE THIRD.

---

ON

SOME PREEMINENT PRIVILEGES

ATTRIBUTED

BY CATHOLICS

TO

MARY.

---

Decens erat, ut ea puritate, quâ major sub Deo nequit intelligi, Virgo illa niteret, cui Deus Pater unicum Filium suum . . . dare disponebat. *S. Anselm of Canterbury, de Conc. Virginis, cap. 18.*



## CHAP. I.

### THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION VIEWED AS EXPLANATORY OF SCRIPTURE.

1. HITHERTO nothing greater has been assumed in this work for the blessed Virgin, than that she began by being a good woman, and that she had extraordinary opportunities for advancing in grace. Of these two positions, the first is an admission which the Angel Gabriel has forced even those out of the Church to make: the second is a fact which nobody can deny, who is anxious to keep from drifting off through Nestorianism into Pelagianism. But all Protestants are well aware that Catholics claim something more for the holy Virgin than this, that we not only have a different and more rigorous idea of a good woman than what they have, but also claim for the blessed Virgin something distinctive. They have mostly heard, that we believe she was assumed into heaven, body and soul, and crowned there by her Son: for this works of Catholic art would bring before them, even if they had never learnt it from books. Perhaps they know too, that we honour her Nativity, because it remains marked in their Calendar, even though the service for it is gone. This book will have suggested to them, that she was early dedicated to God in the Temple before she conceived Jesus. But all these privileges they know very well are nothing to one we do claim for her, which is, that she was conceived without sin. If

she was so conceived, it is no wonder that her Nativity is honoured; no wonder that she early adopted an angelic kind of life in the temple; no wonder that Christ selected her to be his Mother out of all women; no wonder that she shared in the way she did in the work of our redemption; no wonder that she died in part in order to be like Jesus, and that death had no dominion over her; no wonder that she ascended body and soul into heaven<sup>a</sup>.

2. Now a person outside the Church may, as I have said, be brought to consider her doctrine as a philosophy, and regard its developments in a purely human light, as things which men were driven to for consistency's sake. He might say, 'I find the theory of her commencing a monastic life in the temple very early<sup>b</sup>: men having once got hold of this notion, were led on to assume, that if she had light enough to anticipate the Christian scheme before her Son's birth, she must have had some extraordinary graces. Therefore they attributed to her a birth without sin, in order to account for the existence of these graces. But when they came to bethink themselves, they found this would not be enough. The Baptist they found had this privilege, and he was only the precursor, not the Mother of the Messias. Hence they were led to assume something more for the Mother, and while they were about it, it was as well to make their God sanctify her as soon as she was created, and not a good bit before the Baptist's time of sanctification. All this, he might say, is a *consistent* phi-

<sup>a</sup> Jo. Damasc. ap. Triart. i. p. 419. εἰ ὁ ταύτης Καρπὸς . . . ταφὴν ὑπέστη ἑκουσίως ὡς θνητὸς, πῶς τὴν ταφὴν ἀρνήσεται ἢ ἀπειρογάμως κήσασα; Comp. Gelas. ap.

Hard. ii. p. 931. ubi [in Christo] causa mortis non erat (puta peccatum) non debebatur et pœna.

<sup>b</sup> See Trombelli, vol. i. p. 298.

losophical process.' Whether then we commence from the principle of the Immaculate Conception, and measure other articles of common belief by it, or whether we commence from these as facts, and assume one thing after another till we are driven to it, the principle itself is found to be perfectly consistent with those other articles. If it is regarded as a fiction, it cannot be condemned as an inconsistent fiction: its consistency with the other articles gives it, as far as it goes, the appearance at least of truth.

3. This consistency might be dwelt upon much here: the Immaculate Conception might be regarded as the key which explains why the other articles were believed. It might be said, if God intended his Church to believe this, it is plain why he paved the way for it by leading her into the other truths; and therefore if you do want to shew that the Church has no commission from God to teach, you cannot, in order to shew this, make out that she holds at one part of her life things inconsistent with what she held at an earlier period of her life, so far as the blessed Virgin is concerned. She may for all this have been actuated throughout by one Spirit, who certainly can lead into truth unknown before, and certainly cannot deny himself. The grand question which a man has to put to himself is, Has God set up on the earth any Body authorized to teach me what is Scripture, and what not, what is my duty to believe and to practise, and what not? Reason can do something towards answering this question. The fact that the Church is the only body which expects her priests to study what may be called the anatomy and pathology of the human soul, i. e. moral theology, may influence one person to believe she is the most likely of all claimants to be the



teacher sent from God to *sinner*s. Her miracles, and the miraculous holiness of her saints, shewn in all ages, and proved by the most incontestable evidence, may convince another of her mission from above. Her unity and harmony throughout the world may act upon another, and her majestic ritual on another, while others may be more influenced by the fact, that the doctrine of the present Church agrees with that of the ancient in all positive matters; that whatever supposed additions have been made, Trent does not discard Chalcedon Ephesus or Nicea, St. Alphonsus make no account of St. Chrysostome, or St. Thomas of St. Augustine, or Petavius of St. Cyril.

4. This kind of marvellous and consistent growth of doctrine is of a very proper nature to influence a person out of the Church, or not obstinately persuaded, when reason is against him, that he is in it. For if there be such things as dim and vague proofs of any present doctrine being early held, they will be dim and vague to those not in the Church. It does not follow, that if you look into the land of Goshen through an Egyptian darkness, you will have the same idea of the light in their dwellings that the children of Israel have, or see the objects with the same clearness: it does not follow, because the Light of the world gives light to all that are in the house, that therefore those without it will see the same things quite as clearly as these do. Nevertheless, a person who is without the house may see the consistency of such things as he does see clearly: till he can prove that he is in the house, he must not complain if he is bid to take heed to a light shining into a dark place. A person out of the Church then, though wholly incompetent to appreciate the value of indistinct texts of Scripture, or the Fathers,

may be competent to judge, whether what is positively and clearly taught by these, is inconsistent with what is clearly and positively taught by the present Church. I say, *may* be competent, because he need not be so, if he judges as some do in utter ignorance of our system, and predetermined to find idolatry and abominations of every kind in it. He may also be competent to see, that even obscurer texts admit of a meaning not at variance with present teaching. Upon such a person the evidence for the Catholic Church from the consistency of her doctrine may be fairly and properly urged; and in this instance he may take the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in hand, and examine other doctrines commonly received before it, and see whether or no they are inconsistent with it. He may see also, whether or no obscure passages, supposed to intimate it, really *may*, not *do*, intimate it. Of this he is not a judge, till he has been some time in the Church, any more than one not a member of a college, guild, or community, would be a fair judge, if those within it put an honest sense on its statutes and prescriptions in a difficult case.

5. To use the Immaculate Conception in this way, is to treat it like a theory which may or may not be true. Its agreement with the things already noticed, is too palpable to require farther comment: assuming it true, they are no obstacle to its truth; assuming it false, they are not demonstrative proofs of its truth, but weak presumptions, or strong, as may be. But the more facts a theory will explain, the more likelihood there is of its truth; and therefore I shall proceed to notice some other and less obvious facts which this theory will explain; and I wish it distinctly and particularly to be observed,

that I do not say it is *the only* theory which will explain each one of them, but that it is a theory which will explain them. This kind of proof is admitted to be proof enough to induce us to accept a theory in physical science, till a better theory can be found; for to do this, will be to shew the *consistency* of this belief with other doctrines, and that accords with the line of argument adopted in the former parts of this Work. It must, however, be recollected, that I am not considering here, what proof is proof enough to make a doctrine an article of faith; but what proof is proof enough to make a doctrine credible to a person out of the Church, and here considered not to have faith, but to be capable of human knowledge only. It is implied, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is neither scriptural, nor ancient, and therefore that the Church which teaches it, is not to be followed: the drift of my answer to this is, that this doctrine, viewed in the only light you have a right to view it, viz. as a theory, will clear up so many facts, that you should admit its credibility, till you have a better theory to clear them up by. And I call texts of Scripture, or of the Fathers, facts merely for convenience and conciseness' sake.

6. Now there is a passage in Isaiah mistranslated in the English versions, and which the Latin<sup>e</sup>, from its great defect in the absence of a definite article, is incapable of translating accurately, but which, so far as the article is concerned, all the Greek versions render faithfully. 'Behold, THE Virgin shall conceive.' This expression must mean one of two

<sup>e</sup> Lucretius agrees with St. Basil in complaining of the deficiencies of Latin. Theology has remodelled that language to suit its purpose.

things, either that it should be the usual order of things for virgins to conceive, or that a virgin known of by the Jews from some other sources should conceive. If therefore we can make it credible, that any such virgin was known of from other sources, the passage is intelligible; if not, the particle 'the'<sup>d</sup> must be given up as a useless and unintelligible appendage to a most important and distinct prophecy of the Messias. The Jews say, that the prophet refers to what Solomon<sup>e</sup> had said, when among the things too hard for him he mentioned 'the way of a Man in a virgin,' and thus they assign a known virgin. But this itself is more obscure than the text of Isaias, and wants some tradition to explain it, though it is perfectly fair to use it as evidence, that in Solomon's time something of the kind was expected<sup>f</sup>. If there were also some other text which would explain it, it would be more satisfactory still to the protestant reader, especially if it were one which led the Jews naturally to expect some great redemptrix.

7. It will be well before doing so to see whether they had any reason to expect a female redeemer of

<sup>d</sup> The Chaldee Paraphrast also has the emphatic form. Hornemann, a recent Jewish commentator, thinks the הנה מלת הנה הוראתה implies this: שהיתה עלמה עברת דרך שם או שהיתה ידועה אצלם כש. The older Rabbins in the Galè Rezia find the same in the article. See Galatinus, quoted by Trombelli xi. p. 101. and R. Martin's Pug. Fidei, fol. 579. and 584. who however does not cite any thing so old as the Galè Rezia.

\* M. Drach, a learned Jewish convert of the present century, has some useful remarks on

the passage in his work, L'Eglise et la Synagogue, vol. ii. p. 70, &c. from whence this information is derived.

<sup>f</sup> There is allusion to the same mystery when he speaks in Eccles. vii. 28. of not finding a woman among a thousand, in connection with the creation of Adam upright. The Chaldee Paraphrast, by referring the man and woman there spoken of to Abraham and Sarah, shew at least thus much, that it was held in those days that the penitent monarch meant some definite man and woman.



any kind. Now it has been profoundly remarked, in a passage quoted above<sup>g</sup> from one of the acutest intellects ever employed in the Church's cause, that it belongs to the same temper of mind to see the truth when veiled in types, and to close with it when openly expressed. And even protestants will allow, that in the Jewish Church there existed a need for this temper of mind, beyond what exists in the Christian, now that some at least of the types have been fulfilled. Even they must admit the existence of prophets and others, authorized to teach and explain what went before, and to develop more fully the meaning of their predecessors. The force of this remark will be felt more strongly, if we call to mind what has been already noticed, that our Lord sanctions the Jewish division of the Old Testament into Law, Psalms, and Prophets; and that under the title of Prophets, the Jews comprehended the historical books, or at least those of them that did not rank with the Psalms. If they had chosen to put Jonas with the former Prophets<sup>h</sup>, as they call Josue, Judges, Kings, &c. instead of with the latter, nobody could have said, 'This is a prophetic and not a historical book:' for it is history throughout. Nor can any principle be discovered why some actions of the patriarchs and prophets should be recorded and some not, so satisfactory as this, that such actions as had a typical meaning were put into the sacred volume, and such as had not were omitted.

8. Now when we suppose certain passages in historical books to have a typical meaning, we are only acting in a manner which that division suggests.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. i. p. 367. The author of Cyril and Nyssen, ἀρκούσι (probably Anastasius) of the οὔτοι μόνου ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων Catena on the Incarnation, πατέρων παραγόμενοι.  
<sup>h</sup> See part ii. chap. 13. §. 25.



If we cannot fix any such meaning to certain parts, neither can we fix any such meaning to the whole of Jonas. Yet because part is prophetical, Christians attempted to shew how the rest may be so<sup>1</sup>. If the Jews called the historical books ‘the former prophets’ only because the prophets wrote them, why did they call Jonas a prophet at all, or why did they not put David among the prophetical writers? When St. Paul argues with those who were liable to turn back to Judaism, he takes it for granted that they will allow that the Old Testament history was full of types, and argues with them on the principles in which he and they had been brought up. It is plain then that historical types of a female redeemer may have served, if not to generate the belief in such a redeemer, at all events to keep it alive when once believed. If there were any such types recognised to be such, then we shall see how Isaias came to speak of some known woman as a consolation under existing troubles; and all we shall have to shew is, that the antitype expected was not only a woman, but a virgin.

9. To make out the first of these points, let it be observed, that in Zabulon there was a town called Nazareth, which some have thought was the native place of Mary, and the town where she afterwards lived. It was situated near to the river Kishon, that ancient river, hard by which lived Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite. Into her hand the Lord delivered the enemy of Israel: she bruised the head of his enemies; and when it was done, the prophetess praised her, and prayed at the end of her prophecy, saying, “So may *all* thine enemies perish.” After Isaias’s time, her prayer was heard for some of those ene-

<sup>1</sup> See for example St. Austin, ep. cii. 35.

mies, when Judith smote off the head of Holofernes, and when Esther had Aman crucified, putting him to an open shame. Types never come single-handed, but have others like them, till the Holy of holies himself is anointed, and the prophecies are sealed. But who does Jael shadow out to us, she that was called by the prophetess, "Blessed above women," in the text? Not the Church so exactly as Mary, who, being born near the same place, smote the head of God's enemies and destroyed his power. Then he delivered them into the hand of a woman. If Jael be regarded as a type of some future female deliverer, we shall see why Isaias spoke of some woman to come, as a person known. But even bearing in mind the existence of the schools of the prophets, authorized to state and explain what had been written before, this will not point out that the deliverer was to be a virgin. We must look for some other text or tradition, which will lead us to the same point as to the expectation of a great female deliverer, and will also add the idea that she is to be a virgin. Now we have already noticed how signally Eve failed in being the mother of all living: it was not till after she had heard the sentence past, which condemned her to die, that she became a mother at all. She needed some special comfort, for having been the means of Adam's fall. That comfort the promise in the Vulgate gives her. 'I will put enmities between thy seed and her seed: *she* shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.' By 'she,' must be meant some promised female seed, who is to crush the serpent's head. If this version be the right one, the whole knot is solved. It is plain why a virgin deliverer was expected, because Eve was a virgin then; and it is no hard thing to

suppose that tradition filled up the link so far as to point out this fact, and give the people reason to expect a virgin deliverer. This would be then THE Virgin described by Isaias, and the crusher of Satan's head typified by Jael and in after times by Judith and Esther. In other words, if Mary was conceived without sin, the meaning of Isaias is plain, the meaning of several types is plain also. What we have to shew then is, that a female promised seed is there intended.

10. Protestants say, 'He shall bruise thy head,' is the true rendering, and take it of Christ; who by being conceived without sin did bruise Satan's head. They have settled therefore for us, that to bruise Satan's head involves being conceived without sin. The head of all evil thoughts is original sin; crush it, and the heart is right, and has no internal enemy to beat down. Thus Saint Augustine says of Christ; "It is to be observed, that the Apostle thought, that in order to shew that there was no sin *in* Christ, it was enough to say, that he *did* no sin. For certainly he would have done sin, even when he had grown up, if he had had it when a babe. For the reason why there is no man, except him, who did no sin as he grew older, is, because he was the only one of men who had no sin in the beginning of his infancy<sup>1</sup>." And with this statement we pre-

<sup>1</sup> c. Jul. Pel. v. §. 57. If it is honest to give this passage as it stands, it is honest to say, that there are abundance of such passages in St. A. and other writers. For myself I can frankly own, that they make to me no more difficulty, in the way of believing the Immaculate Conception, than

the text, 'who only hath immortality,' does in the way of believing the immortality of Angels and Spirits. See part i. chap. xiii. §. 10. The same modes of 'evading' Scripture difficulties against the teaching of the Church, which was found useful in early ages, will be found useful now.

sume protestants will not quarrel: all we have to settle for them is, that a female seed nevertheless here is intended. To make this plain, it is to be observed, first, that nothing but tradition can do this: for in Hebrew, as in French and Italian, there are but two genders, and seed is in the masculine gender. To render the passage literally, it ought to be, '*it* shall bruise thee on the head:' and then other considerations must decide of what gender the promised seed is to be. I confess honestly, that I do not think any impartial scholar now-a-days would attempt to force the Latin upon you, as a possible literal translation of the Hebrew. However, regarding the Latin as a tradition fixing what in itself is unlimited and uncertain, it is of great importance. For it is antecedent to Jerome's time<sup>k</sup>, and though rejected by him, was retained after his time, which puts it beyond a doubt, that nothing was found in the Christian teaching of that day to prevent their clinging to this traditionary interpretation, even when another reading was offered to them. This is the more remarkable in days when Hebrew scholarship was at its lowest ebb, and some people at all events were ready enough to go by the authority of St. Jerome, whose grammatical knowledge of the language nobody probably would now-a-days maintain, or think much of. It is possible too, that the Septuagint, which is a Jewish authority, had the neuter gender of the pronoun here<sup>l</sup>. If this were so, the Latin might only be

<sup>k</sup> Sabatier ad Biblia Ital. in Gen. iii. 16. mentions Augustine and Ambrose before, and Gregory the Great after, Jerome's time, as reading ipsa. But the

text was seldom quoted by the Fathers. See F. Perrone de Imm. Conceptu, part i. cap. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Sab. mentions the reading, αὐτὸ σοῦ τηρήσει. When a σ fol-



handing on the interpretation given by the Jews before Christ. In either case, the Latin version is an important traditional evidence as to the meaning attached to the text, though in the latter it is implied, that Jewish as well as Christian tradition fixed it to a female seed, or at the least left it open to that interpretation.

11. But to shew that the context does not at all determine it to a male seed, a very few words will be necessary. The common way of understanding the text among protestants is exceedingly arbitrary, whereas they, who do not claim to have the Holy Spirit's guidance as the Church does, have no right to be arbitrary. They say, 'he shall bruise,' means, 'Christ the seed of the woman shall bruise thy head:' but that 'thou shalt bruise,' means the devil, and not the seed of the devil, shall bruise Christ's heel. Whereas the enmities are to be between the seed which is to bruise, and the seed which is bruised. Now if the seed which is bruised means a whole generation of vipers, then the seed which bruises ought to mean a whole generation of saints. The seed of Satan ought to correspond to the seed of Eve. If by Satan's seed many are meant, then many ought to be meant by Eve's seed. If by Satan's seed one is meant, then by Eve's seed one should be meant also. If Satan does not gender other devils out of his substance, then the sonship to Satan is only a figurative and relational sonship, not a real one: and the seed of Satan must be another devil like himself, or else other devils like himself. If Eve does gender other women out of her substance, and the seed of Eve is to be paral-

lows, such insertion is very common: as the final s was not in use in earlier Mss. See Bast. ad Greg. Cor. p. 251.



leled to the seed of Satan, it must not be in the derivation of substance in which they are paralleled, but in the possession of a common substance with certain attributes in common. Devils do not derive their substance from Satan; all men and women, Christ and Mary included, do derive their substance from Eve.

12. It is absurd then to contrast Eve's seed and Satan's seed in their substance: it is reasonable to contrast them in those points in which the seed and the stock are like each other, but unlike the contrasted seed and stock. Satan overcomes a woman: a woman, her seed, overcomes Satan's seed. Here is a contrast perfectly reasonable. This woman when overcome was a virgin conceived without sin: the woman's seed when not overcome but overcoming was a virgin conceived without sin. Here is another contrast perfectly reasonable. The woman who was overcome was taken from Adam, the virgin who overcame was also sprung from Adam. In every possible point, where the woman and the woman's seed can be like, they are like. Mary was in all things like as Eve was, sin only excepted: if she had been like her in sin, she could not be said to have bruised Satan's head. Try the other interpretation on the words, and the contrast comes to naught. Satan overcame a woman: Man overcame Satan. Satan overcame a virgin creature: the Creator, her seed, overcame Satan. Satan destroyed the creature without sin which God had made: the Creator, who could do no sin, destroyed Satan or his like<sup>m</sup>. Either then I am

<sup>m</sup> Is there not a latent Nestorianism in the protestant interpretation? May it not be that men eagerly maintain it, not because they think ortho-

doxly of Christ's divine power, but because they look upon him as a creature capable of being paralleled with Eve?

to go by the context like a critic, or by tradition like a Christian: but I cannot see but what they both lead me to the same end. The question is, how a word of the neuter gender, as 'it' would be in English if literally translated, is to be limited in order to make sense. When I take up a babe, I speak of *it* as of the neuter gender: but surely its looks and voice and features may determine me as to which it is likely to be.

13. Here then we see how, if a virgin deliverer was expected from the first, Isaias's expression becomes at once intelligible. THE Virgin shall conceive, that well-known Virgin which you have known, which you have heard of from the beginning, which you have heard of and your fathers have told you, whom Abraham, when in a vision he saw Christ's day and was glad, beheld along side of him, whom Gideon's fleece pointed out, into whom David told us God would descend like rain into a fleece, whom Solomon found too hard to understand, whom Jael was a type of, in so remarkable a way that a prophetess was inspired to praise her for an action, which, at first sight, looks like a breach of all hospitality. Such thoughts might have crossed Isaias when he saw her glory, and prophesied concerning her, as 'THE Virgin.' Cut away this meaning of the text in Genesis, and you may be fairly defied to produce any explanation so natural as that here offered for the text of Isaias. You allow, that to bruise the serpent's head, implies to be free from original sin; if you see thus much only, that the promised seed may be a female seed, then you will have in Scripture itself, without going to Jewish tradition, a woman spoken of as a deliverer<sup>n</sup>,

<sup>n</sup> The fact that the belief in a Virgin deliverer was kept up in the traditions of the Gentiles, makes it highly credible

a virgin also, and one like to her, who though she indeed afterwards fell into it, yet was created without sin. So far then the theory of the Immaculate Conception, considered as theory, serves to explain facts. It harmonizes a whole series of types and prophecies, and brings them into such accordance with each other, that even the critic cannot say, that the promise in Genesis must be explained in accordance with the rest of Scripture, which requires the seed to be a male seed. For the types here noticed of the blessed Virgin form numerous and respectable signatures to the interpretation of the text of Genesis propounded by the Church. If these types may be expounded of the Church, the Virgin in Isaias may be so expounded, and the male child in the Apocalypse of the Church's great men. For if this exposition is impossible in Isaias, it is impossible in the Apocalypse, and those Fathers who so took the latter passage were wrong. And if this be so, you will give us at least a Scriptural authority for the Assumption of the blessed Virgin, while you are defending yourself against the application here made of Isaias to defend her Immaculate Conception. But in this way you will make her rise again as Christ did, and raise the question how it came that death had no dominion over her°. For unless you will side with Pelagius, you must say that death came in and reigned through sin. *Gratiam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurrit.*

that it was kept up among the Jews. If this belief was drawn from the text of Genesis, and tradition cotemporary with that promise, we can see how it came to be so widely diffused. See Morris, Essay on Conversion of Hindus, p. 90—98. Drach. *L' Eglise et la Syna-*

*gogue*, ii. p. 225.

° St. Epiphan. *Hæres.* 78. §. 11. says, Scripture has left her text uncertain, *ἵνα μή τις ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ γένηται περὶ αὐτῆς σαρκικῶν πραγμάτων*, 'lest any one should suspect the accidents of the flesh about her.'

14. Again, supposing the interpretation here put upon the passage of Judges to be the right one, we shall see how the Archangel Gabriel did right to quote it in addressing the blessed Virgin. ‘Blessed art thou amongst women,’ are words taken from the Septuagint version of the fifth of Judges. Surely an Angelic memory could not have used words on so important an occasion at haphazard! or Mary, if it was she who told St. Luke what happened then, have faltered in her memory! or St. Luke have lost the gift of the Spirit on purpose to stumble into this coincidence! When we read in the history of Samuel’s youth words very similar indeed to those in which the youth of our Lord is described, we take the hint, and see directly of whom Samuel was a type<sup>p</sup>. When we try to find where our Lord is called a Nazarene in the prophets, we are content with the obscurest hint out of a historical book. Yet when Gabriel quotes Judges plainly, we do not believe he means any thing by it. Certainly, if there is a great chance that all Scripture history contains allegorical or mystical teaching below the letter, there is a far greater chance that an Angel should understand it better than we. The darkest hint of one about the court on earth is often caught up and noticed: are we to attribute nothing to the quotation of one about the presence of the Lord God omnipotent?

15. When in an earlier part of this work<sup>q</sup> we were putting the Angel’s words at their minimum meaning, in order to see how much God could do for a good woman, when he had been born of her, these words were passed purposely over, as if part of a common salutation. But surely it is more

<sup>p</sup> 1 Kings (or 1 Sam.) ii. 26.      <sup>q</sup> Part ii. chap. i. §. 3.  
 Luke ii. 52.



religious to suppose, that if common words *were* used, they still would have no common meaning, when an Archangel used them to one so graced as Mary with God's favours. Hence the very phrase, 'Dominus tecum,' was taken by St. Peter of Alexandria in a passage quoted with approval by the Fathers of Ephesus and Chalcedon, to mean more than a common salutation, and to imply the Incarnation. Hence these councils, in some measure at least, sanction the principle of believing, that the salutation which disturbed the humble Virgin, was replete with no ordinary meaning. If we suppose the Archangel, out of condescension to her humility, to use the least commendatory words he could, how naturally again upon the supposition of the Immaculate Conception may his meaning be filled out. 'Hail, you that *have been* graced as none ever was, by being conceived without sin! with all others the devil was from their beginning, with you the Lord is and shall be! you are blessed as the antitype of Jael, having destroyed the enemies of the Lord, having bruised the head of Satan in the tent of St. Anne's womb, with that weapon of divine grace God has put into your hand to ruin his power! Because you were mortal outwardly like all others, and of the race of him that was first made on the earth<sup>r</sup>, you seemed to Satan likely to give him the ordinary hospitality, but like Jael you deceived him with appearances only to crush him.' Can any one say on this supposition, and seeing that the Angel quotes the words used of Jael, that such an expansion of his words would be else than easy and natural? \* Here then again the theory before us serves to clear up facts: it is plain why the Angel quoted those words of Debbora,

<sup>r</sup> Wisd. vii. 1.



and why Debbora was inspired\* to praise an action, which but for its typical meaning seems little deserving of a place in holy writ. Decipit exemplar vitiis imitabile.

16. If, however, we suppose Mary, in virtue of some singular gift of grace, to have crushed original sin, and to have had that inheritance of guilt, which would naturally have come down to her, cancelled by a miracle, we need not suppose the miracle to have suspended in her parents whatever there was in them, to transmit that sin. It is indeed becoming to believe, that God would, in creating so great a personage, diminish the brute passions which it seems are the channel through which the turbid stream of original sin flows on to us. Yet it is not absolutely necessary to suppose even this: Sarah supposed herself to be about to suffer such an evil pleasure even in her old age†: and therefore Mary's parents may have had to suffer it as well as Isaac's, or Samuel's, or the Baptist's. Yet it is to be observed, how Almighty God created these great Saints from parents whose passions were numbed by old age, as Mary's parents were also said to have been. It need only be said then, that God used the course of nature

\* Judges v. 26, &c.

† Shall I have pleasure when I am old, said Sarah, and my lord is old? Gen. xviii. 12. so the Protestant version. The Heb. has, היתה לי עדנה. St. Jerome, voluptati operam dabo. The Chaldee, תהי לי עולימו, and so the Syriac. These all come to the same thing. The LXX have rendered the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον עדנה, as if made from ער הנה.—Augustine, Sermon. li. §. 23. may be compared here:

Si qui viri propter creationem tantummodo liberorum uxores habent, si eis posset præstari ut haberent filios sine concubitu, nonne ineffabili gaudio tantum beneficium amplecterentur? nonne cum ingenti lætitiâ susciperent? Of Isaac's miraculous conception, after several remarks, he denies that he said, as Julian pretended, sine concupiscentia carnis fuisse procreatum. c. Jul. pt. iii. §. 23.

and the natural effects of old age to pave the way to that personal gift to his own Mother, which is claimed for her, and for her only. With this consideration before him, no man could suppose that the dutiful Son of Mary would not have done more for his own Mother than for any one else. If a distinct revelation about her in particular forced us to the conclusion, that Mary was less favoured than the other Saints, then indeed we should bow to God's statement, and hush the voice of human reasonings. But as there is no such thing, it is fair to infer from what is told us of the Baptist being sanctified in the womb, that he who said, 'Honour thy Mother,' would do more for her. This is a natural consequence of believing Christ to be very God.

17. Neither can it be urged against this, that the Scripture says, 'of those that are born of women, there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist. For Christ is particularly said by St. Paul to be himself made of a woman : and therefore till the question is settled whether Mary was in the kingdom of heaven or no ; whether by a grace given in anticipation of Christ's coming, and owing to the foresight of that coming she was not already a Christian ; what was said of John cannot be urged against her without begging the question. It is even possible, that in this declaration of our Lord, there should seem to lie hid a declaration in favour of the Immaculate Conception. For if none be greater among those born of women than the Baptist, and if Christ was greater who was born of a woman, it might seem, that by 'born of women' was meant, born in the ordinary state of guilt. The expression, 'born of a woman,' occurs thrice in the Book of Job, and *not elsewhere*. In each case, misery and sin is connected

with it. Man (it says) born of a woman, living for a short time, is filled with many miseries<sup>u</sup>. Again; What is man, that he should be without spot? or he that is born of a woman, that he should appear just<sup>v</sup>? And again; Can man be justified with God? or he that is born of a woman appear clean<sup>w</sup>? It is remarkable, that St. Paul does not use exactly this expression of our Lord, but, ‘*made* of a woman<sup>x</sup>.’ It might seem then, that our Lord, who knew always all that he had said in his Prophets, might have used this expression to mean, ‘Among all conceived and born in original sin, even Jeremias included, there was never a greater than John the Baptist.’ So far as Scripture language goes, that would be what ‘born of a woman’ would seem to mean. And as John was held not to have been born, although conceived, in original sin, the reason why none born in it was greater than he, is plain.

18. If it be said, in reply to this, that our Lord there speaks of two states, and contrasts the state of the best under the Law with the state of the least under the Gospel; not meaning that the meanest Christian considered in himself is better than the Baptist, but that the privileges of the former are greater than those of the latter, much as those of a priest are greater than those of a layman, though a good layman may often be better than any particular priest:—this indeed has been put

<sup>u</sup> Job xiv. 1.

<sup>v</sup> Job xv. 14.

<sup>w</sup> Job xxv. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Galat. iv. 4. It is said, that “*ילדי א*” is a common phrase in Hebrew: neither Buxtorf, nor Nork, nor Landau, give any examples of it in their Rabbinical Lexicons. Wolf in

Matt. xi. 11. refers to Scaliger in *Schurzfleischii Actis Lit.* p. 24. which is not accessible to me. But Wolf himself was a consummate Rabbinical scholar: so this assertion ought to be true, though I have no means of proving it.

forcibly before me, yet I am not able to remove from myself the impression, that our Lord had his Mother present to his intention when he uttered these words<sup>\*</sup>. He must have been perfectly conscious at the time, that his Mother was in the kingdom of heaven, and not "the least" in it: perfectly conscious too, that she was actually greater than the Baptist, and therefore not born of women in the same sense as the Baptist, that is, not in the Scripture sense of that phrase, not born in original sin. To say there is no greater among those born of women than John the Baptist, is not true, if the expression merely means, 'none greater among men;' for Christ is man, and is greater than the Baptist. To contrast those born in original sin with those who shall have entered into the kingdom of heaven by water and the Spirit, is reasonable. If therefore 'born of women' means 'born in original sin,' what Christ will assert is, that none among those in that condition *is* greater than John. From this we might infer, that none greater than John is in the state of original sin. Then what our Saviour would say is, 'Though none be greater than John of all born in sin, yet baptism, unlike circumcision, does not exempt from original sin only and nothing else, but puts the faithful into a state of sonship to God and brotherhood to Me, higher than even the Baptist's state.' In such a state he knew Mary was.

19. If however we examine the context, we shall see, that what our Lord really says, leads more obviously to this meaning. 'There hath not been raised up a greater,' are words to which 'prophet' should naturally be supplied from the preceding verses. Now the expression is used of our Lord in

<sup>\*</sup> See part ii. chap. vi. §. 10—12.



St. Luke<sup>y</sup>, ‘A great prophet has been *raised up* amongst us.’ So the Greek verity: and the Hebrew verity in Deuteronomy<sup>z</sup>, ‘A prophet from the midst of thee, from thy brethren, shall the Lord thy God *raise up* unto you.’ This alone would make one see, that our Lord meant not absolutely, there is no greater *man*, but, as St. Luke actually states it, there is no greater *prophet*, than John the Baptist. Our Lord’s words, as St. Matthew gives them, refer to the very passage of Deuteronomy, in which our Lord himself is spoken of. Yet he was in some sense surely born of a woman, but not in the Scripture sense of the phrase, i. e. not in such sense as to include being conceived and born in sin. Hence the text does not exclude those not conceived and born in sin, from being greater prophets than the Baptist. Mary then may, for all this text, have been not only a greater personage, but greater, as a prophetess, than the Baptist was as a prophet. For the text so explained will not say any thing about those not conceived and born in sin, as for instance of Christ, but of the rest of mankind and of the Baptist. Therefore no one can urge it against Mary’s privilege, if it cannot be urged for it. But if without all doubt the less is blessed by the greater; if Mary blessed John by bringing Jesus to him, (without whom neither priest nor layman can give or receive blessing;) if Jesus, knowing all he had done from the first instant of his conception, had this in his mind<sup>a</sup> when he spoke of the Baptist; then it is likely that he felt and thought at the time he spoke, that Mary, who blessed John with the gift of prophecy, was greater than John, as

<sup>y</sup> Luke vii. 16.<sup>z</sup> Deut. xviii. 15—19.<sup>a</sup> See part ii. chap. vi. §. 12.



having enjoyed rationality and immunity from sin from the first<sup>b</sup>.

20. Holy writ represents the history of our salvation to us by parts: at times it speaks as if man was a passive machine in the matter; and weak or wicked persons may rest upon these passages to the exclusion of those other and more numerous passages which insist upon man's freedom and responsibility. Nevertheless, in spite of these obligations on our part, Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith. We may view in the way explained above<sup>c</sup>, God's part in the matter of our salvation, apart from man's part. A predestinarian ought at this rate to be the last person to object to any amount of privileges conceded to Mary by her Son. All we see of the creation shews us, that there are no sudden transitions in it, but that there are a variety of grades, each leading gently and without abruptness to the highest. Consequently, if we know of what Christ did for the Baptist in the womb, the predestinarian theory would lead us to think he did more for his own Mother: nay, the Catholic doctrine of predestination forces us to feel the exceeding antecedent probability of this, a probability so strong, that it would add a great deal in itself to weak external proofs, as internal probabilities always do. The use the Church makes of many passages of the Old Testament shews how strongly she feels the weight of this probability. Such for instance are the passages, 'From the beginning and before the ages was I *created*;' and, 'The Lord hath possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before he created any thing from the beginning'<sup>d</sup>;

<sup>b</sup> See part ii. chap. 2. and part i. chap. 2. §§. 4, 5, 6.

<sup>c</sup> Part i. chap. vi. §. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Ecclus. xxiv. 14. in Officio B. M. V. Prov. viii. 22. in Missâ B. M. V.

and the like. Here God is supposed by the Church to have Mary before his mind in her Son, who is called in the Apocalypse, ‘The beginning of the creation of God<sup>e</sup>.’ The major part of the ancients take the passage in Proverbs of the Incarnation<sup>f</sup>. And as the Incarnation includes the idea of a Woman to take flesh from, Mary must be included in that interpretation. Nay, it seems as if the passages suit best to some one definite person, and that person a creature, and that creature free from sin. Of the same tendency is that remarkable passage in the Book of Wisdom<sup>g</sup>; “I also am a mortal like to all, and of the race of that earthly one who was first made, and was shapen as flesh in my mother’s womb: in the space of ten months I was coagulated in blood of the seed of man, and the pleasure of sleep concurring. . . . I was nursed in swaddling clothes, and with great cares.” It is impossible not to feel, that some great personage who is expected, who is called Wisdom, and who is not, like our Saviour, without an earthly father, is spoken of in this passage<sup>g</sup>.

21. Another passage used by the Church upon the feast of the Conception, is also worth consideration. In our Lord’s genealogy, only five women are mentioned; the incestuous Thamar, the harlot Rahab, the Moabitess Ruth, the adulterous wife of Urias, and the Virgin Mary. Now this also seems to lead the same way as the Scripture doctrine of predestination already mentioned. For if our Lord exhibited his purifying powers upon women who were but his remote ancestors, it is natural to

<sup>e</sup> Chap. iii. 14.

278. c.

<sup>f</sup> See Petav. de Trin. ii. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Chap. vii. 1.

§. 3. and on St. Ephrem, p.

expect, that he would exhibit them in some far more marked and extraordinary way upon his own Mother. By telling us the names of only four of his remote female ancestors, and those all with some stain upon their character, he seems all but to exclaim to us, 'See, there is no stain so deep that I cannot wash it out: by what I have done for these, divine what I can do for my Mother. However deep the stain of original sin is, I can wash it away. If I do these things in the dry tree, what shall I do in the green?'

22. Neither can it be said, that this passage would tell as well the other way; as it might be said, if Christ could fit great sinners for being his remote ancestors, much more could he fit a person who had no stain, but that of original sin, for being his immediate parent. Because this would be altogether to pretermitt the intrinsic character of the dispensation by which we were saved, which was not an exhibition of God's attribute of power, but one of his attributes of justice and of mercy: his power was only put forth in subservience to these. Hence in his lowest estate upon the cross he triumphed, according to the teaching of the Church<sup>b</sup>, not by power, but by justice, over his enemies: and hence too it would have jarred with the whole dispensation, if he had chosen some Magdalen to be his immediate parent, and by a sort of mercy which savoured more of arbitrariness and domineering display, than of gentle goodness, had created himself a flesh from that which had been defiled. If we assume the very diametrical opposite to this, assume, i. e. that he made his power as subservient as by any stretch was possible to his mercy, then we shall see that he ought not to withhold from his Mother any thing,

<sup>b</sup> See Petav. de Incarn. ii. 5. §. 10. Berti. *ibid.* p. 243, 244.

the loss of which could possibly occasion her any regret. The moment he created her, in the sight of his divine nature, ‘which is indivisible and altogether,’ she was his Mother. It would have been inordinate in her to desire any thing which it was impracticable for a creature to have: but every thing else she may reasonably be supposed to have had, so far as it helped towards our redemption. These desires her Son knew before they existed, and before he was her Son. The relation of Maternity is a personal gift to herself, incommunicable to any others. From all this it will follow, that it is fair to argue from the exertion of power, in behalf of remote ancestors mentioned in the genealogy, to the exertion of much greater power in behalf of his immediate relative Mary. Because, in either case, power is displayed not singly and solely as power, but in subservience to mercy. And when Mary has to thank God for redeeming her, she has neither actual nor original sin to speak of, as the Magnificat shews. The mercy then which Christ shewed to his remote ancestors in disannulling the stain of their actual sins, and allowing them to hand on the material for his sacred flesh, is a sort of warranty for the much greater mercy he would shew his own Mother, in setting her free from sin of every kind whatever. And this seems a useful application to make of the lecture of the Gospel, which occurs upon the feast of the Conception.

23. To all this there is an objection raised from certain texts, which speak in general terms of all mankind as under sin, and short of the glory of God, and the like. In reply to this objection, texts are sometimes urged, like that, ‘all men are liars,’ ‘all seek their own,’ and the like: where nobody sup-

poses that the word 'all' includes those who upon some other ground are obviously excepted; that a law of this nature necessarily implies a lawgiver; and that a lawgiver has a power to grant exemptions in certain particular cases. But as it is unlikely to the last degree, that those who pretend to go by the Bible *only*, should trouble themselves with the question of the Immaculate Conception, it is idle to consider here, whether the deductions by which the objections are met is valid or not. The plain thing to say seems to be, that all general rules must be taken to hold in every single case that comes under them, unless there be an authority for the exemption in any particular case. What we have to make out then is this; whether the Church, the only authority upon such matters, authorizes the exemption in this case: the chief weight of what has been urged from Scripture lies in the fact, that the Old Testament encourages us to expect a great female redeemer, a promised seed, who should trample upon the head of God's enemies.



## CHAP. II.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION VIEWED AS EXPLANATORY OF TEXTS  
OF THE FATHERS.

1. **ALTHOUGH** the faith in the Church's heart remains one at all times, the means we have of ascertaining what it was at any given time vary exceedingly. Various are the reasons which prevent her doctors from speaking always, on all subjects, with equal precision and distinctness. Sometimes human language, and ideas, and associations, will have so different a turn in one century to what they have in another, that these which are the only vehicles we have for communication of ideas, create an appearance of discrepancy, where there is no discrepancy in reality. Sometimes it is expedient to use ambiguous and amphibological language, in order to avoid greater evils likely to be gendered by barking forth every truth as distinctly as it appears to the mind. Sometimes the loss of documents or the forgery of spurious ones gives us a false impression as to the real tone of feeling in any given century. Sometimes the want of clear assertions on the part of great doctors seems to have acted upon other and subsequent doctors as a ground for making embarrassed and undecided sentiments. These difficulties are difficulties only for the learned; they are difficulties which might be raised in any age against any doctrine about to be made an article of faith; which have, as matter of fact, been raised against

many most important doctrines; and which are no difficulties whatever to a person who makes the Church the pillar and ground of the truth.

2. Nevertheless, the existence of these and similar difficulties is that which prevents our looking reasonably for more than probable evidence, as to what the opinion of the Church was in former centuries. And one species of probable evidence is furnished in our case by the fact, that the Immaculate Conception explains, and clears up, and harmonizes certain traditions. And this species of evidence is itself reducible to the head of consistency with previously believed doctrines. Arguments drawn from the *fitness* of the Immaculate Conception may also be said to come under the same head. But as their force will be more felt, when the former sort of probable evidence has been first considered, this *à priori* probability, so far as it is considered at all in this work, will best come in after something has been said of the former nature.

3. There is an objection, however, which may be raised *in limine*, and which it is as well to weaken or destroy here, as may be, before we proceed any farther. It is commonly supposed then, that St. Thomas Aquinas, a man of gigantic learning and reach of thought, regarded, to boot, as a very great doctor, opposed the Immaculate Conception. Now this objection seems to contain three things: first, a statement of fact, that the Angelic doctor opposed the Immunity of Mary: secondly, that he was learned and clever enough to know the feeling of the Church of other times, and of his own: and thirdly, that the Church, by the respect she shews to his doctrine, gives a weight to his judgment, and an importance to the fact of his opposition. Upon

these three things, three remarks may be made: If the authority of the Church gives weight to St. Thomas, the authority of the Church can take it away in any particular instance. If the learning of St. Thomas himself gives him weight, he may have been deficient upon this particular instance. If the *fact* of his opposing the Immaculate Conception can be made uncertain or improbable, the other two objections become good for nothing, or for very little. Again, the authority of the Church has given a weight to the assertions of St. Augustine in all matters of grace, such as the question of the Immaculate Conception is. St. Thomas paid the greatest deference to St. Augustine's authority, but the work in which St. Augustine most strongly asserts the Immunity of Mary from Satan's thrall, though in existence, was unknown in St. Thomas's day: therefore he was so far shut out from the natural oracle to consult upon questions of grace, in this particular instance. These assertions will be made good by and by; for the present it will be enough to say a few words upon the question of fact, Did St. Thomas oppose the Immaculate Conception?

4. Now a learned Benedictine, who distinctly exempts the Dominican order from the guilt of having done it<sup>a</sup>, has made it probable in the very

<sup>a</sup> Celestino Sfrondrati Innocentia Vindicata. Typis Monast. Sti. Galli, A.D. 1695. p. 107. 'Dico gravissimis indiciis probari posse Sancti Doctoris de Conceptione Immaculatâ sententias corruptas fuisse (innoxio semper tamen Prædicatorum Ordine) et proinde nullam fidem mereri: and a little further on; Multis et maximis fraudibus impugnandæ Imm.

Conc. ab aliquibus (quos ipse sacer Ordo Prædicatorum semper detestatus est) laboratum est. In chapter v. he shews that the Dominicans, who are bound by oath to maintain St. Thomas's doctrine, many of them maintained the Immunity. Some say St. Dominic himself clearly taught it: see presently.

highest degree, that the manuscript copies of St. Thomas's works have been wilfully corrupted upon this subject. To give details here would occupy too much space. But the following facts are worth giving consideration to: viz. that both manuscript and early printed copies of St. Thomas have passages distinctly maintaining the doctrine: that John Bromiard, a Herefordshire Dominican, who died about 120 years after St. Thomas, quotes St. Thomas as authority for the immunity, and that Joannes a S. Thoma, one of the most celebrated Thomists that ever lived, who died in 1544, asserts, that St. Thomas nowhere taught that Mary was conceived in sin, but only laid down principles which would shew, that if no privilege interfered, her parents would have transmitted sin to her, without determining whether in fact that privilege was withheld<sup>b</sup>. The same great Thomist also states, that celebrated Thomists found no difficulty about this question of fact<sup>c</sup>. So that there seems to be very great reason to doubt if it is true, that St. Thomas held what some of the printed editions and manuscripts make him hold upon the subject.

5. There is another thing which it is important to bear in mind in the whole of this question, viz. that the schoolmen universally believed, that in all human beings, except Christ, the flesh of man began to exist several days before the soul was placed into it. This quaint notion, which seems to have no support worth considering in early tradition<sup>d</sup>, is a question for the

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. pp. 8, 9. I am assured by a learned friend, that Sfrondrati's quotations have been verified by himself, and may be depended upon.

<sup>c</sup> Ferrariensis in Summ. c.

Gent. iv. 50. is also quoted to the same effect; see ed. Rome 1750. p. 480. col. 3. K.

<sup>d</sup> See above, vol. i. p. 368. notes b. c. To the latter note may be added, that Cyril, in



physical philosopher rather than for the divine to decide. Still as all sciences use principles drawn from other sciences, theology might fairly borrow this from the physiology of the day, which neglected the test of experimental proof, or such approximations to it as really may be had. And it so happens, that the supposition of the body's preexistence helps us to treat this question with greater ease. In certain cases we are obliged to conceive of Christ's human nature what we may not believe of it, viz. that it existed before he took it<sup>e</sup>: this theory about the body's preexistence conceives in a similar way of man's nature what there is no ground for believing of it in physiology. Nevertheless, both the one and the other help us to state things more distinctly, though we have to correct the impression, when we have once mastered, what we wish to master by separating them. It is easier to conceive the flesh of the Virgin Mary as a flesh of sin, by supposing it existed before the soul was placed into it, than to conceive it as a flesh of sin, in right of descent from Adam, though not in fact: it is easier in other words to give a fictitious preexistence to her flesh, and then attribute certain evils to it, than it is to attach these to that flesh, after asserting that it had no preexistence, and that its existence can only be severed from that of the soul, by an act of the mind.

a fragment of his work against Diodore, given in Mai. Coll. Nov. vii. p. 87. expressly denies the preexistence of the body. *Ψυχὴ μὲν καὶ σῶμα εἰς ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν προανίσχει πατέρα ὅτιος* and Eleutherius (or Etherius as I suspect it

should be, a cotemporary of Cyril's and a Nestorianizer) of Tyana in the next citation; *Μηδέτερον χωρὶς τοῦ ἑτέρου προ- ἄγουσαν ἔχει ὑπόστασιν.*

<sup>e</sup> See part i. chap. ii. §. 8. chap. xiii. §. 16.



6. The fiction of preexistence, then, is a very useful fiction: it gives, if the expression may be permitted, an intelligible rendezvous for all those passages of the Fathers, which attribute to the blessed Virgin a flesh of sin. Scarce one of these passages would create any difficulty worth considering in the way of believing the immaculateness of her soul. They simply state what the natural condition of her flesh was, owing to its descent from Adam, and viewed apart from the *supernatural* office to which she was called. She could not have called God her Saviour, unless the foresight of his merits had had some such natural condition to rescue her from, as she was being created. In acting thus, the Fathers would do no more than what they did with our Saviour's soul<sup>f</sup>, when they spoke of it as it would have been in itself, and apart from the consideration of its union with Almighty God. Refuse the use of this principle to explain passages seemingly against the Immunity, and you have no right to use it to explain passages seemingly against the wisdom of Christ's soul: refuse the use of it in this latter case, and you may find authorities for Arian tenets in the Fathers, or for the mortality of angels in Scripture.

7. Let us then assume objections drawn from the language of St. Thomas and the Fathers to be so far set aside; and proceed to consider, whether there are not certain facts to be met with in antiquity, which the theory of a belief in the Immunity will clear up. I am not here alluding to passages which may be thought distinctly to assert Mary's immunity from Satan's yoke, but to such as taken together, and not taken one by one, can be more easily explained by this than by any other theory. And

<sup>f</sup> See part i. chap. xi. xiii. xiv.

it is to be observed, that no pains is taken here to keep to hackneyed quotations and misquotations on the subject, though most of those actually used, have been used again and again. The reason of this is, that hitherto the subject of the Immaculate Conception has been a domestic controversy: now it is so universally believed by all Catholics, that a Catholic who disbelieved it might be shewn as a phenomenon; so well known by those out of the Church to be believed by them, that it is proper to attempt to defend it even before them.

8. Now there is such a variety of modes in which the traditions which tend to prove a belief in the Immunity may be arranged, that it is difficult to hit upon the most expedient mode for bringing the evidence of that belief before the reader. However, the easiest method to adopt for the use of readers of this book is one which falls in best with the system adopted in the course of it, and by which the rest of it is ruled. That system is directed to shew the consistency of the later evolutions of Catholic doctrine with earlier ones, and in particular the consistency of the worship paid to Mary, with the doctrine of the Incarnation.

9. Suppose then we go back to that time when the last great Council directly relating to the Incarnation was held, and see if any statement can be found there bearing, *as* there stated, upon the Immunity of Mary, but capable of being traced back into remote antiquity. As an echo in a vast and sinuous valley is less audible and less distinct at the points which are farther off from the place to which the voice which occasioned them had last passed on; so the Church's outward and tangible expressions of doctrine are not as clear in remote antiquity as in

later times, though she be but one and the same divinely speaking voice which has moved from one place in the whole of time into another. Hence we are not to be surprised, if what the Council of Frankfurt said in the eighth century is clearer than the earlier echoes of its voice. Still, assume that Council to have meant the Immaculate Conception, and it at once becomes a theory which will serve as it were to generalize a number of facts upon: a theory, therefore, which may be adopted till some safer and clearer one can be adduced. This seems enough to be able to do with a view of defending the belief in the Immunity, not to those within the Church, but to those without it; to those, that is, who are inaccessible to all those arguments drawn from the authority of the Church, considered as a living, and ruling, and teaching body.

10. In the Epistle of the Synod of Frankfurt to the Bishops of Spain and France we find the following passage: "Was not the blessed Mary, as far as this world's nobility is concerned, a Virgin sprung from a royal and free stock? Now it was to this Virgin that the Holy Ghost came, and caused a Son to be born from her. 'Twere strange if the Holy Spirit could not create from her a Man perfect and free-born. But we should like also to ask you, whether Adam, the first father of the human race, who was created from *virgin* earth, was made free, or a servant? If a servant, how then was he the image of God? If free, why is Christ also not to be free-born from the Virgin? For he was made man from a better earth, and that too animated and immaculate, by the operation of the Holy Spirit<sup>g</sup>." Here we have a comparison between the earth out of

<sup>g</sup> Hard. iv. p. 891.

which Adam was made, and Mary out of which Christ was made. This, if I may so put it, is the parable in which the Church opens her mouth upon the subject of Mary's Immunity. If she really keeps to this simile, it will say all we want: for the earth out of which Adam was made, was earth antecedent to the curse: therefore the earth out of which the second Adam was made, ought to be earth exempt from the curse, or, in other words, the flesh of Mary whatever it was *de jure*, ought *de facto* not to be flesh of sin. And that the purity of the soul will follow from that of the flesh we shall see in the sequel. This passage of the Fathers of Frankfurt then may be considered to be one of those passages, not which necessarily teaches, but which most naturally may be explained by the theory of the Immaculate Conception. It seems desirable to shew that it is the expression and summary of a widely spread tradition, and not the invention of the eighth century.

11. Before attempting this, however, let it be remarked, that there are other theories upon which such passages may be explained. Thus it may be said, that they mean no more than to compare the earth and Mary in these two respects: as the earth had not then been ploughed when the first Adam was made, so when the second Adam was born, it was not from any human agency, it was not of the will of man nor of the will of the flesh, but by the unseen operation of the Trinity, that the Virgin conceived. Thus St. Cyril says: "He bowed the heavens and came down, and having chosen out the virginal womb of a Maiden holy and brought up in piety, with an Angel's voice to foretel the birth and explain beforehand the mode of conception, and stay the Virgin's fear by that explanation, he gets him a



house, and prepares himself a temple, and shapes the tabernacle unsown and unploughed for. For he that first became the slave of sin was without a father, and had the earth alone for his mother. . . . And this was why the only-begotten Word of God, when he took from a Virgin alone the beginnings of his formation, and in this way made himself a Temple untilled for, and united it to himself, comes forth from the Virgin without loosing the zone of Virginity by his conception, or bursting through it by his birth<sup>h</sup>." Now several passages of this kind might easily be found; and it is commonly said, that they shew that nothing more can be concluded from passages like that from the Fathers of Frankfurt, in which the word 'immaculatâ' should be therefore put at its lowest meaning, and interpreted 'untouched by man.' Whether there is not something more in the word even in less cogent passages than this, shall be considered by and by. For the present suffice to observe, that the natural meaning of the simile, as given by the Fathers, is not interfered with by the fact, that the same two things may be compared in different aspects and different points. The unbroken womb and the unploughed land may be compared, without thereby taking away the liberty of comparing the flesh uncursed by original sin, and the land not yet cursed in consequence of it. But this is not all: for as the land came to need the labour of ploughing owing to the curse, land unploughed and land uncursed are ideas naturally connected when we are speaking of the beginning of the world. Neither

<sup>h</sup> Ap. Mai. Coll. Nov. viii. part 3. p. 90. Cyril, like the prophets of the Old Testament, does not much mind the rules of rhetoricians against mixed metaphors. The expressions ἀσπαρτον ἀνέσπορον remind one of Œdipus Tyrannus: the use of ζωνή too is classical.



could they who spoke of Christ as born of none but a Virgin, because sin was so intimately blended with generation after the ordinary course<sup>1</sup>, speak of the unbroken womb, without recurring to that absence of sin, which occasioned that womb's exemption. Therefore when they seem to depart from what has been here taken to be the natural meaning of the simile used at Frankfurt, they do not seem to depart from it so far, as some would have us believe. Their minds are still hovering about the same ideas, and only passing to connatural, not to contradictory, ideas.

12. That the same simile might have been made to express the doctrine more clearly, is readily admitted. It is thus said to have been stated by St. Dominic: "As the first Adam was formed from the virgin earth which was never cursed; it was fitting that the same should be the case with the second Adam, that is, with Christ, whose Mother was never cursed." Miracles are said to have proved the acceptableness of this volume to Almighty God: the Bollandists decline entering into the question of its genuineness, but Quetif and Echard, very sufficient judges, intimate no doubt on the subject<sup>k</sup>. Here however it is only quoted to shew, how the same parable expresses the doctrine more clearly, when its terms are a little eliminated. Let us proceed to consider the antiquity and catholicity of this simile, setting alongside of the passages adduced any thing which may throw light upon them. For although a writer of considerable antiquity has the same expression as St. Dominic, yet as it is in one of the sermons falsely attributed to S. Amphilochius, it would not tell much here.

<sup>1</sup> See vol. i. p. 99. m.

and E. Script. Ord. Præd. i.

<sup>k</sup> Boll. in Vit. p. 524. Q. p. 87.

13. Now there exists an epistle of the presbyters and deacons of Achaia, giving an account of the martyrdom of St. Andrew, in which the following passage occurs: "Because it was from immaculate earth that the first man was created; it was necessary that from an immaculate Virgin a perfect man should be born, that the Son of God, who of old had created man, might make good the eternal life which men had lost through Adam." This makes the parts of the simile more striking, and the use of the word 'Immaculate' of the Lamb offered on the Altar, in the same epistle shews pretty well in what sense the author of that epistle used it. That the generality of critics regard this epistle as spurious<sup>1</sup>, does not much signify for the purpose it is here cited. For that it was *not* regarded as spurious in the eighth century, seems plain from the fact, that it was cited by Beatus and Etherius<sup>m</sup> at that time, in the very controversy for which the Council of Frankfurt was held. And this use of that word makes it clearer, in what sense the Fathers of that Council used the simile which has been cited from them. However it does seem, spurious or not, to have had an early existence. For there existed in St. Austin's time some Acts of St. Andrew, which he did not believe to be genuine<sup>n</sup>. Those Acts embody, it is believed, most of the substance of the Epistle, and are probably therefore a subsequent compilation. St. Austin, in the words succeeding the passage in which he rejects the Acts, is to all appearance alluding to the well-known passage about the Sacri-

<sup>1</sup> See Lumper. vol. i. p. 202. who, after Gallandi and Woog, defends it himself.

<sup>m</sup> Contr. Fel. i. v. fin. p. 342.

Canis.

<sup>n</sup> See contr. adv. Leg. et Proph. i. 39.

fice of the Altar°. This makes it highly probable, that a Latin version of the Epistle existed as early as the fourth century. And this would be enough in itself to make it credible, that the Fathers of Frankfurt were using, what they knew to be an ancient and long-received simile.

14. Let us then proceed to see whether in other parts of the world the existence of the same simile is not to be found. ‘For woman’s sake,’ says St. James of Edessa, in a passage already cited<sup>p</sup>, ‘the ground was cursed to bring forth thorns and briars; but after blessed Mary came, the thorns were pulled out.’ Here the comparison in question is plainly not a thing with which St. James was unacquainted. The *cursed* ground leads him to think of the *blessed* Virgin. The same sentiment here exists substantially as was taught more plainly by St. Germanus of Constantinople in the eighth century, when he calls Mary ‘the earth in which no thorn of sin sprung up, but by whose seed, on the contrary, it was fully rooted up<sup>q</sup>.’ Theodotus of Ancyra, Proclus of Cyzicum, Basil of Seleucia, and Hesychius of Jerusalem, compare Mary not merely to the earth, but to the very Paradise of Eden<sup>r</sup>. Here again the idea of the earth antecedent to the curse is what is wanted to make sense of their words: for why not content themselves with saying, ‘the unploughed

° *Immolat Deo Ecclesia in corpore Christi sacrificium laudis.*—Chrysologus, Sermon. 5. has the expression, *Hic est vitulus qui epulum nostrum quotidie ac jugiter immolatur*; which words also seem to allude to St. Andrew’s expression. St. Peter built a Church to him in Ravenna, unless I misrecollect;

but I regret I have not the Acts or Epistle at hand, and can only quote from others. It is, however, a hackneyed quotation.

<sup>p</sup> p. 174. z.

<sup>q</sup> Sermon. iv. quoted by Maracci in v. Terra.

<sup>r</sup> See Newman’s Athanas. p. 291. note i.

earth,' or 'the untilled earth,' without specifying the Garden of Eden, unless the idea of land exempt from a curse made up an item in the simile they had before their minds. St. Chrysostome too, who was from Antioch, has a similar idea\*. That she is so compared to the earth or Paradise is a fact: the Immaculate Conception is one theory which will explain that fact. And we see herein that the idea was one widely spread in the East. If we add to this the fact, that Proclus called Mary '*the only bridge* between God and men', and said that on Christmas day "the error of Eve was taken away and forgiven through the purity of the Virgin Mary": if we recollect that St. James of Sarug, a great Syrian doctor early in the sixth century, said, that 'if there had been any spot or defect in her *soul*, he would have looked him out some other Mother with no spot in her': then we shall be led to reflect, that these leading eastern Bishops really may have meant that Mary had never had any curse upon her when Christ took flesh from her.

15. Neither should the dim and vague nature of such statements be urged against the possibility of such being the meaning of these Fathers: for we ought to remember, how much more clear the testimonies of an early date are to John the Baptist's rationality in the womb, than those to our Lord's rationality at that time". God, if we may venture to speculate on the matter, seems to have secured to us clear proofs of what we ought to hold about the Baptist: and having given us this and common sense, to have left us with weaker proofs of Mary's privilege, thinking us able to draw the conclusion in

\* Ibid.

† ap. Garn. ii. p. 20.

" ap. Mai. Spicil. iv. p. xcii

° ap. Assem. B. O. i. p. 310.

" Above, part ii. chap. ii.

§. 11.



her favour from the clear proofs given us in John's case.

16. It should also be observed, that if the Fathers who use this simile do omit to notice the fact, that Mary was never under the curse, the reason of this omission is easily assignable. Having to maintain the belief in the Incarnation before Pagans and Pantheists, they are set rather upon shewing that God took a *real* flesh from Mary, and that it lay within the compass of his power to create himself a body from a Virgin, than upon considering the state of purity in which that flesh from whence God took his own might be. This will explain such passages as the following from St. Leo : " The earth of human flesh, which, in the first transgressor had been cursed, did in this birth from the blessed Virgin, and in it only, yield a Germ that was blessed, and a stranger to the defect of its stock." Here it might be said that Leo looked upon all flesh, the Virgin's included, as under the curse. This is really true, if we regard the statement as made about the flesh only, and about the flesh considered as what it was in its own right, and about the flesh considered as deprived in all even in the Virgin herself, of the *right* to that immortality and heavenly glory which it would have had if it had continued upright. St. Leo clearly has also the Manicheans (whom he mentions presently after) before his mind, and wishes his congregation to feel, that the curse under which all *flesh* but Christ's is by nature, is no proof whatever that the devil is the creator of that flesh\*. But of this more will be said by and by.

17. From these considerations it will follow, that the fact that this simile, even when the exemption

\* Serm. iv. in Nativ.



from a curse is not specified, was spread far and wide in the world, *may* be some sort of presumption, that the belief in the exemption was spread far and wide also. For it is not likely that Christians of those days who used the simile so far as it would hold against heretics, Jews, and heathens, would confine themselves in their own closets to this use of it, and fail to try, if there were not other points also in which the doctrine delivered to them would explain the simile. Be the account of St. Andrew, referred to above, at what date it may, it serves to exhibit to us this further application of the simile in actual operation.

18. That the simile was in use in the West may be seen from the following passage. St. Irenæus says, "As the protoplast Adam had his substance from the uncultivated and yet virgin earth, (for God had not yet rained upon it, *and* man had not worked the earth,) and was shapen by the hand of God, that is, by the Word of God, (for all things are made by him;) and God took clay from the earth, and formed man; so, that Adam who renewed all things in himself, being himself the Word from Mary who was yet a virgin, did with good reason undertake the production of Adam's renewal. If, therefore, the first Adam had a man for his father, and was born from the seed of a man, they would say with good reason, that the second Adam too was gendered from Joseph. But if he was taken from the earth, and formed by the Word of God, then ought he also who renewed in himself man who was formed by God, to have a resemblance to man in respect of his generation also<sup>v</sup>." It is obvious, that we might argue in a precisely parallel way: 'If he

<sup>v</sup> Iren. iii. 21.

was taken from earth that knew no curse, then *ought* Christ also to be taken from her who knew no curse.' Tertullian borrows the simile from Irenæus, as does St. Ambrose also, if we may argue from the number of words from Irenæus which occur in the passage<sup>z</sup>. This traditionary simile then was widely spread, and seems especially calculated to keep up the memory of the Immaculate Conception if then in existence, and in some cases to be so worded, as to require that belief to explain the very wording fully.

19. There is another ancient tradition, that one reason why our blessed Lady was espoused to Mary was, that 'the Offspring might be concealed from the devil.' This, if it means any thing, must mean, that the devil might suppose the Child was born in the ordinary way. But if this was to be an effectual means of concealing the truth from him, it must imply also, that there was something singular either in St. Joseph or in Mary, which kept Satan aloof from them, and prevented his knowing the truth. Now if Mary had already given him proof, that she neither then was vanquished, nor ever could be vanquished, as not only lacking the original sin, through which he overcomes Adam's posterity; but also having, what Adam had not, the gift of perseverance; then this tradition of St. Ignatius is full of meaning, and it was worth St. Jerome's while to repeat it: but who is able to discover in any other way a rational meaning in it, conformable at once to Mary's dignity, and the known malice and pride of Satan? Whether this tradition does not imply, that Satan had also a great dread of Joseph, need not be considered here; it is enough to shew how

<sup>z</sup> In Luc. iv. 7. (comp. in Christi, 17. quoted by Newman, Ps. i. §. 35.) Tertull. de C. l. c.

the supposition of Mary's immunity will explain such a fact as this tradition may be considered to be.

20. Other facts may also be noticed as meeting with a solution upon the theory of the Immunity, even if they do admit of other explanations. For instance, the pains of childbirth were introduced as a penalty of sin: now though it is true, that the whole guilt of sin may be removed without the whole penalty being removed, yet, when any chief penalty has been removed, the simplest mode of accounting for its removal is the supposition that the guilt is removed. The latter theory is enough to account for this anciently and universally asserted fact\*. Again; the shock which Catholics felt of old at heretics saying, that Mary needed purification<sup>b</sup>, is another fact which also *can* be explained upon the same theory. Eliminate sin of every kind from the blessed Virgin, and there is no matter for the rite of purification to operate upon. Again; the zeal of our Lord for the integrity of his Mother's body, so constantly believed in the Church, seems strange and out of place in him who made so light of mere material pollutions, unless it was preceded and flowed from a zeal for the integrity of her soul. These (and similar things perhaps) might be observed in the doctrine of the Fathers, which, if you take them singly, do not bear much upon our present

\* What is asserted here is, that the singular removal of the guilt *will* account for the singular removal of the penalty; and not that penalties necessarily imply the existence of guilt. The seventy-third condemned Proposition of Baius asserts the latter; it runs as follows: 'Nemo præter Christum

est absque peccato originali: hinc beata Virgo mortua est propter peccatum ex Adam contractum, omnesque ejus afflictiones in hac vita sicut et aliorum justorum fuerunt *ultiones* peccati actualis vel originalis.' Ap. Hard. x. p. 1210.

<sup>b</sup> Above, p. 3. n. d.

purpose, and when adduced for it may easily be sneered at: but put them altogether, and consider them as producing something analogous to ‘what they call *the effect* in architecture, or other works of art<sup>c</sup>,’ and they impress one strongly with a notion which way the tradition of the Church was leaning. A theory which explained so many facts could hardly fail to be acceptable to those who pertinaciously clung to those facts. If other separate theories could and do explain them individually, this comprises and comprehends them all, like as the ‘love of our country embraces all other charities.’ I repeat then, that I am not considering here what is sufficient evidence for authorities within the Church to build an article of faith upon: but what is sufficient evidence to induce those without the Church to regard a commonly admitted belief, as no reasonable barrier to their becoming Catholics. They cannot *prove* that it is a new doctrine: they think they can make it probable, that the Fathers never believed it: we think we can make it probable that they did. How is this to be decided, without a living authority?

<sup>c</sup>. Butler, Anal. part i. ch. vii. init.

## CHAP. III.

OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE DOCTOR OF GRACE TO THE IMMUNITY  
OF MARY.

1. WE have seen in the first part of this work, that when the Church first made decrees upon the subjects of grace and predestination<sup>a</sup>, this doctrine was regarded by some persons as a novelty. Various are the difficulties, and insurmountable appear to be the evils, of preaching such a doctrine. For St. Augustine it was not enough to shew that it was every where taught and implied in Scripture; but he wished also to shew that it was part of the teaching of the Church from the first, and not a purely human tradition, a mere deduction of his own brain from God's word. To prove this, he has recourse to the prayers and rites of the Church, which obscurely imply the doctrine<sup>b</sup>, and by no means thrust it undeniably before us as the Church's view of the matter. When he treats of the predestination of Christ, he seems to be building on a single controverted text<sup>c</sup>; and he has by no means considered all the difficulties in the way of such a doctrine, which may be raised either from Scripture or tradition<sup>d</sup>.

2. From this it appears, that the difficulties in the way of the doctrine of grace, so far as Christ is

<sup>a</sup> Chap. vii. §. 15.

<sup>b</sup> See part i. chap. v.

<sup>c</sup> See *ibid.* chap. vii. init.

<sup>d</sup> See *ibid.* §. 4. and ix. 13. to the end.



concerned, are in several respects analogous to those in the way of the bearings of the same doctrine upon Mary. There is a controverted text which states clearly the predestination of Christ: there is a controverted text which states clearly that Mary bruised Satan's head. There is hardly the slightest vestige of Christ's predestination, except in heretical writers and in a heretical sense, before Augustine's time; and the same nearly may be thought to be the case in regard to Mary's privilege. It might be added, that as the fulfilment of numerous types was used of old to prove the truth of Christ's advent to Jews and heathens; so the existence of great female deliverers, each in some way *bruising the head* of God's enemies, constitutes, to persons out of the Church, a proof of a similar kind, of the truth that Mary bruised the serpent's head. A fool may laugh at such proofs on earth, while Julian or Porphyry in hell is wishing perhaps that he had attended to proofs precisely analogous\*. The fact that there are difficulties in the way of establishing a doctrine, does not then disprove it: if the analogies, by the medium of which it may be established, are multiplied in later days by the increase of dogmas and points fixed by the Church; the documents by which it might once have been established may have been more numerous in earlier days. Each age has its own advantages for proving Christianity<sup>f</sup>: and what one had not, that another enjoys.

3. It might, however, most naturally be expected,

\* Plato, Rep. i. 5. says of the sinner on his deathbed: οἱ ΜΥΘΟΙ, περὶ τῶν ἐν ᾧ δου, ὡς τὸν ἐνθάδε ἀδικήσαντα δεῖ ἐκεῖ διδόναι δίκην, κατὰ γελωμένοι τέως, τότε δὴ στρέφουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν,

μὴ ἀληθεῖς ᾧσι: see also part ii. chap. xi. §. 9.

<sup>f</sup> See Origen in Joan. ii. §. 28. August. Serm. cxvii. §. 17. Butler, Anal. ii. chap. vi. p. 310.

that in a long controversy, such as that of Augustine with Julian the Pelagian was, some tolerably explicit statement of the doctrine of Mary's Immunity should be elicited. The subject comes into works on grace now: why did it not do so then? or why, at least, was so singular an exception to the doctrine of original sin, taken no notice of whatever? Such a question, we may conceive to have presented itself to the devout and humble-minded Thomas of Aquino, when doubtless he wished to say all he could find explicit authority for, in praise of the Mother of God. And it so happens, as was intimated above, that the very work of St. Austin, in which he most plainly denies that Mary was ever under Satan's thrall, was lost for many years. It was found by Vignierius in the seventeenth century<sup>g</sup>, at the monastery of Clairvaux, where it lay hid, to come forth in time and defend the piety of the Canons of St. Irenæus's city from the severity of St. Bernard. This work was that which the reader has often seen quoted in these pages, as the *Opus Imperfectum* against Julian. It appears to have been left without the finishing hand of its holy Author, to tone down and smooth away those strong expressions of indignation, which were naturally excited in the rough draft of the work, by the hardened impudence of the heretic therein confuted.

4. Now it is perhaps not desirable in itself, to delay the reader's eagerness to see what the great doctor of grace said upon the subject: yet it may be desirable in this book to shew, by first producing vague and indeterminate passages from St. Augustine, and then more cogent ones, how the controversy upon grace gradually forced Mary before the world,

<sup>g</sup> Noris, Op. i. p. 827. Bened. Præf. ad Op. Imperf. p. 582. ed. Antw.

as well as did those upon the Incarnation, both before and after St. Austin's day. And if the controversy with the Manicheans, as involving the discussion of free will, is made here to belong, as a prelude, to the controversy upon grace, it will be a liberty which will be easily forgiven. Let us proceed then to put together such testimonies of an obscurer or clearer kind as may be found in some of the writings of the very greatest authority upon the subject of grace that ever wrote. It is needless to say how often the Popes have bestowed their praise upon him, and how uneasy those, who try to prune down his authority as much as they possibly can, appear under these statements of the Holy See<sup>h</sup>. The applause of centuries, and continued affection of the Church for him and his doctrine, is the best proof of the importance to be attached to his statements.

5. We find up and down St. Austin's works, several statements to the effect, that Christ took flesh of a *woman*, because he was minded to honour both sexes. Now this is a position which may mean a good deal to our purpose, and may mean a very little. It may mean, that Christ honoured the whole male sex as a body, by taking flesh and becoming one of that sex, and the whole female sex by taking that flesh, not from the earth, not from the stones, (out of which he *could*, had he pleased, have raised up children to Abraham,) not from any where, but from a woman. In this way such a statement would mean very little. But a similar statement might mean a great deal more: it might mean, that Christ carried out his scheme of redemption in such way as to honour both sexes

<sup>h</sup> See Noris, Vind. August. cap. viii. p. 1196.

in those two persons in particular, through whom it was carried out: that as Eve was originally inferior to Adam, and dependent upon him for her creation, in such way that without him she would not have existed; so Mary was inferior to Christ, and dependent upon him for her re-creation: that as Adam and Eve were both made upright, and both sexes dishonoured in them by the fall, so by the restoration of man both sexes might be honoured in the two persons immediately concerned in it. This indeed appears to me to be the vision before the Church's mind from the first, and the only thing which will adequately support the language, say of Irenæus, or of the others, who regard Mary as the counterpart of Eve. But what I wish to observe here is, that it is very possible for one and the same writer to use the same expression in different senses: the statement when it means its least, is not contradictory to the statement when it means its most, but compatible with it. It is no reason whatever, because there *is* a minimum of meaning, that that minimum should be looked upon as the corrective of an apparent maximum, and the standard to which the latter is, as matter of course, to be reduced. This premised, I shall proceed to give some passages of both kinds.

6. In one of his early sermons he writes as follows: "We profess that the whole nature of body comes from God, its Almighty Creator: and consequently, wherever our Lord took his body from, he would be taking it from his own creation: but in his humiliation he preferred taking it from a woman, as he had come to liberate that lost creature which had fallen through a woman. Hence as he wished to raise the hope of renovation and



restoration in both sexes, he chose the male sex to be born in it, and the female to be born through it. You that shudder at the chaste womb of a Virgin, choose, I pray you, where God should take his body from! You say that every body is the substance of the ‘race of darkness:’ choose then, as I said, where God ought to take his body from!<sup>i</sup>” This is from a sermon in which he is arguing against Manichees. Here he seems to be putting things at the lowest, much as when he says in a sermon on the Resurrection: “Because man fell through the female sex, by the female sex man was repaired: because a Virgin had been Mother to Christ, woman announced that he had risen again. By woman death came, and by woman life. But the disciples would not believe it was as the women said<sup>k</sup>.” Here it may be said, he is not making woman the cause of our salvation, except in the loose sense, that a person who causes us to know a thing, may perhaps be called the cause of it, or as a day is called joyful from the event that occurs on it.

7. The following is another cognate passage. “Suppose I cannot shew you why he chose to be born of a woman; you shew me, what there was in woman that he should shun. But I have said already, that if he were to shun a woman’s womb, it would look like hinting the possibility of his being contaminated by her. But the more incapable of stain he was through his own substance, so much the less must he needs have dreaded the womb of flesh, as if there were any chance of his contracting a stain from it: but by being born of a woman, he must needs have shewn us some great mystery. For indeed, brethren, we too confess, that if the Lord had wished

<sup>i</sup> Serm. xii. §. 12.

<sup>k</sup> Serm. cccxxii. §. 2.



to become man so, as not to be born of a woman, it was surely easy to his Majesty. For as he was able to be born from a woman without a man, so he was able to be born without a woman either. But what he shewed us is this, that human creatures were not to despair of themselves in any sex, seeing that both males and females belong to a human sex. If then being a man, as he must needs have been, he were not to be born of a woman, women would despair of themselves, recollecting that the first sin was theirs, because the first man was deceived by a woman, and would fancy that they had no hope in Christ themselves whatever. He came then a man, to choose first the male sex, and by being born of a woman, to console the female sex; as if speaking to them, and saying: that you may know that no creature of God is bad, but that an evil pleasure perverts it, in the beginning when I made man, I made him male and female; I condemn not the creature which I made. See, I am born a man! see, I am born from a woman! It is not then the creature which I made which I condemn, but the sins which I did not make. Let either sex see its own honour, and either confess its own iniquity, and either hope for salvation. When man was to be deceived, the poison was rendered to him by woman: when man is to be repaired, let salvation be tendered to him by woman. Let woman make compensation for the sin of man whom she deceived, by giving birth to Christ. Hence too it was women who were the first to tell the Apostles of God rising again. A woman told death to her husband in Paradise: women told salvation to men in the Church. The Apostles were to tell the Resurrection of Christ to the Gentiles; women told it to the Apostles. So let nobody calumniate Christ

for being born of a woman, from which sex the Redeemer would not be stained, and which sex the Creator ought to commend<sup>1</sup>."

8. This sermon does not seem to be directed to a very Christian-minded audience. Further on in it he says of Mary, she "had *merited* to bring forth the Son of the Most High, and yet was most humble: nor did she put herself before her husband, even in the order of the name, so as to say, I and thy father; but, Thy father and I. She does not attend to the dignity of her womb, but to her rank as a wife. For the humble Christ had not taught his Mother to be proud<sup>m</sup>." Elsewhere he spoke of the virgin Mother who did not conceive by the law of the flesh of sin, that is, by the motion of carnal concupiscence, but *pre-merited* by pious faith for the holy seed to come into her<sup>n</sup>. And even in one of the passages just given he says, "*because* a Virgin had been Mother to Christ, a woman announced that he had risen again." Although then St. Austin does use words which admit of a minimum of meaning, they also admit of a maximum: all he says would be perfectly true and reasonable, even if he thought all the while that Mary had earned woman all these privileges by her merits with Christ. Of other Christians he says, "However, if you think about it, it was he that first gave the faith whereby you *pre-merited* him; for you did not *pre-merit* of your own stock, so that any thing should be due to you<sup>o</sup>." But whether he would say so of Mary or not, will be plainer perhaps by and by.

9. "What (he says in another place) if the

<sup>1</sup> Serm. li. §. 3.

§. 38. above, vol. i. p. 390.

<sup>m</sup> §. 18.

n. s.

<sup>n</sup> De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. ii.

<sup>o</sup> In Joan. tr. iii. §. 10.

Almighty created a human nature formed any where but not from a mother's womb, and suddenly brought it before our eyes? What if he underwent no changes from childhood to youth, took no food, no sleep? Would he not countenance the idea of some misconception, and be believed not to have in any true sense taken human nature, and while he was doing all things miraculously, be taking away what he did mercifully? But as it is, he appeared in such way Mediator between God and man, as in the oneness of his person to unite both natures, and to lift things ordinary aloft to things extraordinary, and temper things extraordinary by the ordinary<sup>p</sup>." Here the same thought, it may be said, is at the saint's elbow, as it were. Again; "The reason why we believe he was born of the Virgin Mary is, not because he could not exist in true flesh, and be seen by men in any other way, but because it is so written in Scripture, which, unless we believe, we can neither be Christians, nor be saved. We believe, then, that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, because it is so written in the Gospel: we believe that Christ was crucified and dead, because it is so written in the Gospel: and truly born and truly dead, because the Gospel is truth<sup>q</sup>. But why he was pleased to suffer all he did, in flesh taken from a woman's womb, is a design the whole of which he alone is privy to: whether it was that he thought fit, that the sexes he had created should be each commended and honoured in this manner by his taking the form of a man, and being born from a woman; or whether

<sup>p</sup> Epist. 137. §. 9.

<sup>q</sup> It is as well to remind the reader, why St. Austin believed the Gospel itself. "I should

not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to it." cont. Epist. Fundam. §. 6.

it was from some other cause, what that cause was, I cannot say at random<sup>r</sup>." Again: "If it had never been [as it was], and the Lord Christ had pleased to come in flesh not taken from a Virgin, but still in real flesh to redeem us from real death, who would venture to say that he could not have done it? But what he did was the better way, to wit, to be born of a Virgin, and to deign to commend by his birth either sex for the ransom of which he was to die, by having his own male body born from a woman, by so doing speaking, in a special way, against you [Manicheans], and overthrowing you who preach, that male and female is the work not of God, but of the devil<sup>s</sup>."

10. These passages, some of them, plainly speak to a desire upon the part of Christ to confer upon Mary *personally* by the Incarnation an honour, which served as the ground or reason in God's mind why other women should be comforted. "Plainly she was the Mother of the members of that body which we are, because she did by love cooperate towards the birth of those faithful, who are the members of that Head<sup>t</sup>." Trace back what St. Austin says of honouring both sexes to the farthest point it will lead you to, and what does it come to? 'The object of the Incarnation was to honour both sexes: man's sex was honoured in Christ; woman's in Mary: man's by Christ taking flesh; woman's by his taking it of Mary: man's by the personal dignity of the Redeemer, conferred by none; woman's by the personal dignity of Mary, conferred by her Son: man's by an entire exemption in Christ from all sin, actual and original; and woman's,—Oh Augustine!

<sup>r</sup> c. Faust. Man. xxvi. cap. 7.

<sup>t</sup> De Virginit. 6.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. xxix. §. 2.



oh my father! oh my patron! I will put a question for myself; yes, I will put one to you, oh may he deign to listen to a child that questions him!<sup>u</sup>—Why do you bring before me God as *Almighty*, having it in his power to take flesh from any where, if you do not mean me to follow out this ascription of Almighty power to the Son of Mary to its consequences? Why make him predestinate John, and Peter, and Paul, and his own human nature, to be what they were, but give no place to Mary among those who have a special likeness to Christ? Is man's nature to be honoured in your system by this special exemption; and woman, though Mother of the Almighty, who was, and is, and is to come, to have no benefit, such as that Almighty power could give it? This is a question which may be fervently put, but must be calmly answered.

11. Now when we come to read St. Austin's works on grace, we find this remarkable feature in them, that as there are occasions upon which it might have been expected that a belief in Mary's privilege would have led to the mention of her, so there are occasions where a disbelief in it would have led also to the mention of her. Of the former case, an instance has been already given<sup>x</sup>: of the latter, an instance may be found in the fact, that where it is specially to St. Austin's interest to produce a sample of a good fruit coming from an evil stock, he never instances Christ coming from Mary. Let us consider this a little more at length. Julian endeavoured to shew, that Manicheism would follow from Augustine's doctrine of original sin. If one

<sup>u</sup> Vol. i. p. 17.

what is the only *source* of all merit.

<sup>x</sup> Part ii. chap. x. §. 17. St. Austin is there considering



human being springs from another, he argued, and a good tree cannot bring forth bad fruit, then either man whom God created is bad; or the bad fruit, man in sin, does not come from the good tree which God created. Therefore either Pelagianism is true, or Manicheism is not false<sup>y</sup>. Now if Augustine could have said in reply to this, 'All allow Christ to be good, and all allow Mary to have been conceived and born in sin,' then the Catholic world must have admitted, that he had produced a flagrant instance against his adversary. Besides, Augustine was perfectly familiar with the texts, 'In Adam all die,' 'All have sinned,' and the like. Why does he not fling them with a graceless recklessness in the Virgin's face, when occasion offered? These are facts, which his belief in the Immaculate Conception would, if it could be made out, perfectly explain.

12. Moreover, there is a distinct and obvious reason why he should be unwilling to enter into the question. St. Augustine was very sharp at foreseeing consequences, and he would foresee readily two uses the Pelagians would make of the Immunity of Mary. One of these would be to employ it, not as Catholics would, as an exception which proves the rule of original sin,<sup>z</sup> but as an item in an induction to disprove that rule. The fact that St. Austin avoided the ordinary statement about the Baptist's rationality in the womb<sup>z</sup>, renders the supposition here made credible: he foresaw the mischief they would make of it. Another use they would have made of it, was as a diversion to turn him off from the grand question in hand. He had been led off once to a long discussion about the origin of the soul, which he brought to no issue, though it serves to shew that he never

<sup>y</sup> See below, ch. v. fin.

<sup>z</sup> See above, part ii. ch. ii. §. 12.

dreamt of the theory of post-existence, as it might be called not improperly<sup>a</sup>. Either then he held the Immunity himself, and saw what a long discussion would be required to put it before others in a serviceable form: or he knew that others held it, and would find it so attractive a subject, as to ensure a digression: or both these alternatives might be true together.

13. Let us see if there is any more definite ground for thinking that he held it himself. Now St. Austin held, as most writers on the subject shew, that if our Lord had *had* sin when he was born, he would have *done* sin when he grew up<sup>b</sup>. This accords with what he so often urges against the Pelagians, that when our Lord told us daily to pray that our sins may be forgiven, it was because we daily do *real* sins that require forgiveness<sup>c</sup>. If then the passage we are going to cite exempts Mary from all actual sin, it follows from St. Austin's teaching most directly, that she was exempt from all original sin; it is too obvious a deduction not to have been seen by so acute a writer. St. Chrysostome and some others have been suspected of making Mary guilty of actual sin, as has been noticed above<sup>d</sup>, but it would not be easy to find a shadow of pretence for accusing the doctor of grace of such a crime. Therefore if he exempts her from all actual sin, he ought on his own principles to exempt her from original sin.

14. The following passage does exempt her distinctly from actual sin, and by inference, if not by

<sup>a</sup> See above, p. 250. n. d.

<sup>b</sup> See the passage above, chap. i. §. 10. Suarez. in part iii. vol. 2. p. 25. disp. Sfondrati, l. c. p. 93, &c. and Valerius de superstitiosa timiditate vitandâ. ch. xiv. if I recollect. I have not access to this work now,

but its strange title has kept it in an obscurity it ill deserves.

<sup>c</sup> See Conc. Carthag. Can. vii. Noris, H. P. i. 13. and in Hard. i. p. 930.

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. chap. x. §. 14. and xii. §. 16.

direct assertion, from original sin. It shall be given at some length, that its drift may be better understood. Pelagius “seems acutely enough to put the question, ‘In what state we are to think the saints of the Old Testament departed this life, with sin or without it? so that if the reply be, ‘with sin,’ their damnation may be supposed to have followed, which is impious to believe; but if it be said they left this life without sin, he may prove that man, at all events when death is near, has existed without sin in this life. And in this, mighty acute as he is, he does not notice that even the just do not say without reason in [the Lord’s] prayer, Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and that the Lord Christ when he explained the said prayer by his doctrine added most truthfully, For if you forgive men their sins, your heavenly Father will forgive you your sins. For by this daily spiritual incense, so to call it, which is brought before God in that Altar of the heart which we are admonished to hold up to him, even if we do not live here without sin, die without sin we may, while from time to time that is by pardon blotted out, which from time to time by ignorance or infirmity is committed. Then he mentions those who are said not only not to have sinned, but to have lived justly, as Abel, Enoch, &c. &c. Joseph, to whom the Virgin Mary was espoused, John. He adds also women, Debora, Anne, Samuel’s mother, Judith, Esther, another Anne, daughter of Phanuel, and the Mother also of our Lord and Saviour, whom, to use his words, it is necessary to orthodoxy to believe to be without sin.’ Now with the exception of the holy Virgin Mary, touching whom, out of respect to our Lord when we are on the subject of *sins*, I have no mind to entertain the question—for how are we

to know what greater degree of grace was conferred, in order to vanquishing *sin* in every respect, upon her who merited to conceive and bring forth him whom all allow to have had no sin?—with the exception of this Virgin then, if it was in our power, to bring together into one place all the saints, men and women, when they lived here, and ask them whether they were without sin, what are we to suppose they would have answered; that which this man says, or that which John the Apostle said? I ask you, how great soever the excellence of holiness may have been which they had in this body, if they could be asked this, whether would they not have exclaimed with one voice, If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us<sup>e</sup>?"

15. That Virgin therefore might, without deceiving herself, say, I have no sin: yet St. Austin said, as we have seen already, that the Apostle thought that in order to shew that there was no sin in Christ, it was enough to say that he *did* no sin<sup>f</sup>. If then Austin had wished to shew that there was no sin in Mary, it was enough to shew, with a view of shewing this, that she did no sin. He adds, Christ would certainly have done sin, when he had grown up, if he had had it when a babe. This is tantamount to making the two necessarily connected. For this proposition is not of the same kind as the following: if the rose withers when it is full grown, it had a canker when in the bud: from which it will not follow, that, all roses which wither when full grown, have a canker in the bud. For there are other commonly known causes from which roses wither; but there is no other, commonly

<sup>e</sup> De N. et Grat. c. Pelag.      <sup>f</sup> Above, chap. i. §. 10.  
§. 41.



known, cause from which actual sin comes except original. Therefore these propositions are not of the same kind, if that be worth noticing. Rather, the proposition wanted for our purpose is like the following in form. All roses which do not wither, had no canker in the bud. Mary, the mystical Rose, did not wither with actual sin; therefore neither had she the canker of original sin. This seems undeniably to follow from St. Austin's principles.

16. It is however to be observed, that some manuscripts, and St. Thomas too, have a different reading of this passage. Instead of the words, How are we to know what greater degree of grace, &c. they have, 'for the ground on which we know that a greater grace was conferred, is, because she merited to conceive,' &c. But the reading of the Benedictine from three Mss. against two and St. Thomas, has been here followed, in default of better and fuller information<sup>g</sup>. With the latter reading St. Austin *seems* to assert, as the reason why he wished to avoid the question, that there were not data enough to settle it upon. Supposing St. Thomas to be acquainted with both readings, it is possible he might have thought that either reading left his oracle ambiguous. We need therefore a more positive statement, and one which will tend to shew, whether or no St. Augustine really meant to express a doubt about the matter: and such passage is the one which in St. Thomas's days was lost to the Church.

17. But let us consider, whether the whole jist of the argument in this passage does not clearly tell in favour of exempting Mary from all sins, actual *and*

<sup>g</sup> Inde enim scimus, and unde enim; quod and quid, quod and quæ, are the only variations necessary to make this change of meaning.



original. What Pelagius contends for is this, ‘that it was not nature which was to be blamed, but men for their carelessness:’ that nature, even as it now is, was equal to the fulfilment of the law: that Adam’s “posterity are not only not weaker than he, but have even fulfilled several precepts, when he neglected to fulfil one.” In furtherance of this he contends, ‘that to make man sinless, is not to make him equal to God; for angels, though sinless, are yet not equal to God: that this doctrine cannot lead to pride, unless falsehood and humility are compatible, and a man may call himself sinner when he is not: that the sins of the saints recorded in Scripture are put there not to shew that *all* men, even the saints, are sinners and need grace, but that even those who have sinned, need not despair: that many are not only never said to have sinned, but styled positively just<sup>h</sup>.’ It is clear then, that the very thing for which Pelagius is contending is, that the absence of actual sin in several persons mentioned in holy writ proves the non-existence of original. This being so, it is perfectly fair to use what St. Austin elsewhere says of Christ, of Mary also. St. Austin’s exempting her from all actual sin, is really and truly tantamount to exempting her from original sin: otherwise his whole argument against Pelagius is good for nothing.

18. Moreover, both before and after the passage quoted he speaks of Pelagius, ‘thinking he is pleading God’s cause by defending *nature*,’ that is, nature as it now is: and of his “invalidating the grace of so great a Physician, by his unwillingness to confess that human *nature* is corrupted<sup>i</sup>.” and the like.

<sup>h</sup> See Garn. ad Mercat. i. words consecutively.  
p. 373. &c. who gives Pelagius’s      <sup>i</sup> 1. c. §. 39. §. 46.

As for his wish not to enter into the question, the reason probably was, because he saw it was a wide one, and would lead off from the real question at issue, (though those who follow the other reading take this to mean, that ‘I am against any body entertaining a doubt upon the subject;’) or the reason was, because he is arguing, as against a heretic who went by the Bible only, from the Bible only. Hence Pelagius says, “let us believe what we read, and what we do not read that let us think it a sin to argue for<sup>k</sup>.” In this case the words, ‘for how do we know,’ ‘unde enim scimus,’ would mean, what text of Scripture is there which states explicitly what you say ‘is necessary to piety,’ or orthodoxy<sup>l</sup>? And with these remarks we may perhaps be satisfied: they suffice to shew, that as the substance of St. Austin’s argument goes to prove his belief in the exemption of Mary from original sin; so the wording of it does not prove that he thought there was no possibility of proving, but only no texts by which a Bible Christian like Pelagius could prove, that Immunity. It is quite in place on this view to say, How can you and I prove what you say so positively about the blessed Virgin, going as we are now doing by Scripture?

19. But the passage in which St. Austin appears most clearly to have enunciated his belief upon this subject, is the one in the *Opus Imperfectum*. Julian endeavours to make out there, that Augustine’s doctrine of original sin was essentially Manichean<sup>m</sup>, and Augustine in reply shews, that St. Ambrose at that rate would be Manichæan in his doctrine too, and that Jovinian had actually called him so. This

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. §. 46.

p. l. n. a.

<sup>l</sup> See Newman on Athan.

<sup>m</sup> See below, ch. iv. §.

Julian denies, but takes occasion to compare Augustine unfavourably with this latter heretic. "He said, that men by the Sacraments (says Julian) were made incapable of doing wrong, but you, that they are not even freed by grace". He makes Mary's Virginity come to an end, owing to the law of parturition; you transfer Mary herself to the devil's book, owing to the law of birth°." Now by these words it is plain, that Julian wishes to make it appear, that St. Austin's doctrine of original sin goes against a received opinion about Mary. To transcribe, is to remove from one book to another: Mary then, according to the received opinion, was in some special way in God's book. As Jovinian violated the received opinion about her perfect integrity after childbirth, so much more did Augustine (in Julian's view) violate the received opinion about the state she was in at her birth. Either thus much must be true, or Julian's contrast is good for nothing. It is clear that his aim is to render Augustine's doctrine odious, by representing it as a worse violation of the ordinary belief of Catholics than Jovinian's: not as a violation of Bible truth, as it is called, for there is no text, except allegorical ones, that tells on either subject, but as a violation of the belief of Catholics.

20. Now the words 'conditio nascendi,' which I have rendered the 'law of her birth,' are by no means adequately rendered by those words: they imply rather the whole set of circumstances attendant upon birth. And, moreover, the word 'birth' is

° Jovinian maintained, that baptized Christians could not sin. Vide Vallarsi præf. ad Hieron. adv. Jovin. §. 3.  
° Op. imp. iv. 122. 'Ille vir-

ginitatem Mariæ partus conditione dissolvit, tu ipsam Mariam diabolo nascendi conditione transcribis.

particularly likely to mislead : it was only so rendered in order to put the passage at its minimum of meaning first, and not at all because it expresses all that is meant by ‘nascor’ in ecclesiastical Latin. The word more nearly answers to our ‘coming into being,’ or the *γίγνομαι* of the Greeks—it includes conception as well as birth ; and it is obvious enough, that what Julian wants for his purpose is to make out that Augustine’s theory of the law by which all human beings except Christ come into being, would make Mary the subject of original sin as well as other people. Now let us observe St. Austin’s answer to this, brief as it is, and we shall see that there is in it the same reference as before to the Lord’s Prayer, and the same reference to Christ as the originating cause of all grace.

21. ‘I do *not* say (he replies) that men are not set free even by grace : and God forbid Ambrose should say so : but we do say, something you will not like, that it is only by grace that they are freed, not merely so freed as to have debts forgiven them, but also so freed as not to be led into temptation. We DO NOT TRANSFER Mary into the devil’s book, owing to the law of birth ; but the reason why we do not is, because this law itself is broken by the grace of being born again<sup>p</sup>.’ The plain meaning of these words appears to me to be this : Mary, like the rest of Adam’s descendants, would have been conceived and born in sin except for grace,—she would have been as we are under the devil, considering the way she came into being, had it not been for the interference of grace to prevent her ever being under the devil. What St. Austin is fighting for is, that human

<sup>p</sup> Non transcribimus diabolo sed ideo, quia ipsa conditio Mariam conditione nascendi, solvitur gratiâ renascendi. *ibid.*



nature apart from Christ, as the originating cause of all grace, is sold under sin : if by not transcribing Mary to the devil, (to render the words very literally,) he merely meant that she was not *born* in sin, and did not mean she was not *conceived* in sin, then he would mean that birth is the beginning of sinfulness, and not conception, which is against the explicit testimony of the Psalmist he so often quoted, out of all harmony with his hesitation about allowing the Baptist's sanctification in the womb<sup>q</sup>, and altogether inadequate as an answer to what Julian is throwing in his teeth. For in the very next words to those which were just cited, Julian says: 'Jovinian puts the better condition on a par with the good, that is, virginity with marriage; you call the intercourse of marriage itself diseased.' On the whole then it seems pretty clear, that had St. Thomas heard the great oracle upon questions of grace, speaking thus, he would have spoken himself with a plainness, which it would have been hard for the most impudent corrupters of manuscripts to have made ambiguous. And we see that it is possible enough that Augustine had before him a maximum of meaning, when he spoke of God honouring both sexes.

22. There is one more remark may be made upon this interesting passage: it is this: that St. Austin from the singular, '*I* do not say,' passes to the plural, '*we* do not say,' '*we* do not transcribe.' Is there then any passage in the writings of the great Archbishop of Milan, who received St. Austin into the Church, which will give a reason for this change of persons, or is it merely accidental? The reader shall judge for himself, whether it is possible that

<sup>q</sup> See part ii. chap. ii. §. 12.



the doctor of grace should have had the following passage in his mind: "Come then," says St. Ambrose, "and seek thy sheep, not by servants, not by mercenaries, but by thyself. Receive me in that flesh, which in Adam fell! Receive me not from Sara, but from Mary! that she may be a Virgin uncorrupt, but a Virgin by grace, entirely free from *every* stain of sin<sup>r</sup>!"

<sup>r</sup> In Ps. cxviii. Serm. xxii. §. 30. per gratiam, ab omni integra labe peccati. The expression 'integra integrum peperit,' used by the author of the De Symb. ad Catech. iv. init. inter Opp. August. vol. vi. p. 424. e. is worth mentioning here, as illustrating Ambrose's word. He speaks as follows: 'Mulierem illam (in Apoc. xii.

4.) virginem Mariam significasse quæ caput nostrum integra integrum peperit, quæ etiam ipsa figuram in se Sanctæ Ecclesiæ demonstravit.' The expression is the more remarkable, as he is speaking of a contest with the serpent. But to this we shall recur in speaking of the Assumption.

## CHAP. IV.

## ANTECEDENT PROBABILITY OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

1. HITHERTO the Immunity of Mary has been regarded here as a theory which will explain facts. This method of regarding it may seem to be a departure from the principles of this treatise, in which an attempt has been made to shew to those without the Church, that the doctrine of the Church, though evolved in very distant ages, is at least consistent with itself. However, it need hardly be said, that, as these facts embody portions of doctrine, the departure is an apparent not a real one. They may be regarded as portions of doctrine, though those without will be more disposed to dispute them as doctrine, than able to controvert them as facts. The theory adduced to explain them they will be even more still disposed to dispute, and therefore something more may be wanted to give it credibility. It has been assumed here, that those out of the Church will not feel the cogency of arguments from early notices of a doctrine in the same way as those in it will feel them. If this were not assumed, the text of Genesis, as read by so large a portion of the Christian world, might have been insisted upon at length as traditionary evidence, and some other external producible proofs might have been examined. But in this case, as in many others, more can be done by shewing the antecedent probability of any thing disputed, than by turning the reader with no prepossessions in its favour in among a number of

facts that may be viewed 'in disconnection, dead, and spiritless,' or may be disputed, or even perverted. If a Catholic were to say, 'I should not believe the Immaculate Conception unless the authority of the Church persuaded me,' he would not say more of Mary's Immunity than St. Augustine said of the Gospels. Still it is probable that arguments drawn from the likelihood of the doctrine, have some part in the conviction which even a Catholic feels, if he be learned enough to appreciate such arguments. And by conviction here is meant a natural, not a supernatural, conviction. We claim to have an unction from the holy one, which teaches us all things by an infused light of faith, by which gift we apprehend not only articles of faith, but other things, more or less near to being articles of faith, when put before us by the Church. But no proof from this is urged here: the tangible and producible consistency in reason between the Immunity and other parts of doctrine supposed to be believed, is all that is urged here to make it more credible. Nor do I concern myself to use just those arguments of this kind which are the current ones, but such rather as seem best suited to the readers of this work.

2. When St. Augustine was accused of destroying free-will by preaching predestination, he did not reply<sup>a</sup> by any attempt at a theory which would reconcile the two, but produced a vast number of passages in Scripture which proved the existence of free-will. He adduced experience also to prove the same. It is quite plain that we can contemplate either predestination<sup>b</sup> alone and by itself, or free-will

<sup>a</sup> De Corr. et Grat. §. 5.      ation in general is particularly  
§. 17—19. §. 25. §. 41.      applicable to its relation to

<sup>b</sup> What he says of predestin-      free-will. 'Ille dicit investiga-

alone and by itself. If we follow out either contemplation singly, we shall come into great and inextricable difficulties; in either case the difficulties are equally great. But we may regard them separately up to a certain point with great profit, both to the intellect and to the moral part of our nature. The Jesuits, (whose miraculous founder discouraged the indiscriminate discussion of predestination, and seems to have impressed upon his whole society the duty of such energetic self-correction, as might look as if he thought free-will every thing,) have been universally defenders of the prerogative of Mary. Several (though a minority) of the Dominicans, whose great doctor followed St. Austin in his teaching on grace, have been its opponents. Let us see how far the Immunity can be shewn to be consistent both with the doctrine of free-will considered apart, and with the doctrine of predestination considered apart; with the doctrine of free-will, the defence of which has been most markedly taken up by the Jesuits; and the doctrine of grace, which in some sense it may be said to have been the special province of the Dominicans to defend.

3. Almighty God could have made some ignorant fisherman as great an agent in converting the Gentiles, as the learned St. Paul<sup>e</sup>: he could have given the learning of Chrysostome or Augustine to some common artisan in an instant. Yet if he had done so, every body would have said that he had departed from his usual course, and superseded that law by

biles sunt viæ ejus, et tu investigare venisti si inscrutabilia scrutari venisti et investigabilia investigare venisti, crede, jam peristi. Tale est velle scrutari inscrutab. &c. quale est velle

invisibilia videre et ineffabilia fari.' Serm. 27. fin.

• Beatus and Etherius, adv. Elip. p. 329. Potuerat Dominus uno die discipulos docere si voluisset, &c.



which he makes us obliged to learn habits by degrees, by repeated acts of free-will issuing in a certain determination of the mind to one course or one state. Nevertheless, in the order of nature he creates beings with vastly different capacities for improvement: not to say any thing of brutes, it is plain that some men have greater natural capacities than others, whether they use them to advance above others or not. We may presume, that when they do so use their greater capacities for greater influence, they fulfil in the order of nature the design of their creation. In the order of grace the same difference is observed. Saints have had great lights bestowed upon them at the first, in so many instances, as to be enough to shew that God can infuse such lights. But then much has been required of those to whom much was thus given. It has been expected that their free-will would exercise itself in proportion to the acquisition of fresh knowledge and graces, or, in other words, that they would subject themselves to that law of habits which runs through the creation. Subjection to this law obliges them to use their free-will in cultivating the original gifts, although clearly in many instances they would not be fit for the business God employs them in, without the original gifts. A great end requires a great beginning: this is the rule, and all departures from it are incredible without the most convincing proof.

4. It is quite true, that Jesus might when in the womb have infused into Mary not only wisdom and grace enough to manage him and rule him for thirty years, but also all the preceding habits which such unusual graces presuppose, in order to make her capable of them. But it would be more in order for him to have interfered earlier, and to have put



her in condition, at the first instant of her creation, for spending every portion of her entire existence beforehand, upon acquiring the habits necessary for this high office. If God had given Joshue the power of stopping the sun as a habitual power, to use just when he pleased, during thirty years, we should expect to find that he had previously given him other gifts, which should enable him to use so immense a power with discretion. If we found he had been born with a perfect use of reason, and had spent his whole life in cultivating the gift, our alarm would abate, and our surprise begin to turn into reasoning. We should feel, that the undeniable fact that he exercised the power, gave a credibility to what was said about his early use of reason: we should see it was quite in order for a person who exercised so great a power, to have been put in possession of means of acquiring gradually the skill and prudence required to use it. It would seem on the whole more like Almighty God (so to say) to give him that skill, before he installed him in office, than while he was installing him. Therefore, if the Immaculate Conception be true, it will enable us to see how it came about without any violation of the law of habits, that Mary could be trusted to command Almighty God for thirty years. Mary, by free-will, increased that gift, and became fit for conceiving, bearing, nursing, ruling, and suffering with, God Incarnate.

5. The period she gained upon this supposition for exercising her free-will, in forming habits extended from the first instant of her conception up to the time of her death. St. Austin's doctrine is, that we are in our present state of stupidity and incapacity for receiving a command at our conception, owing

to sin. Remove original sin entirely, and the power of adoring God would naturally begin with our conception, for we should be conscious of him, and hear his command. Hence the blessed Virgin would have spent nine months in St. Anne's womb, something in the same way as Christ spent the nine months in her own womb.—This is what would be, not of necessity, but naturally: God did not necessarily give Adam and Eve in Paradise all the gifts they enjoyed, still those gifts are natural in the loose and popular sense of the word 'natural:' they are what, when given, seem such as we might expect from so good a God. But if by 'natural' is meant inherent or inseparable from human nature as such, then they are not natural.—Mary could have earned graces for her mother: God could give them to his. She could have either known or prayed to know her mother's thoughts, and have obeyed as if they were words. She could have performed a vast number of actions of merit in the womb and in infancy, and would have found herself able to retain and understand Scripture, and enter into God's counsels with a depth and foresight wholly inconceivable to us. If we were to be made capable of retaining with perfect order and distinctness all the deepest conceptions of things ever put before us in meditation, or all the accompanying affections, in such way that we could marshal the whole host of them, and bring their united force to bear upon each fresh inspiration, it is plain that we should soon arrive at a very profound knowledge of God's ways and judgments. We should anticipate the future to almost a certainty, by our clean and unconfused impression of the special laws and circumstances at work in former parallel instances. If we wished to appear like common men, and still

more if God ordered us to appear so, we should be obliged to use expressions which they would be sure to misunderstand, and should seem to their blockhead childishness to be hypocritical, lying, or designing, if they were allowed a glimpse of our knowledge, and measured our speech by their conception of it; we should judge of it something as the graceless Porphyry did of Jesus, or men of the world of Jesuits.

6. The knowledge<sup>c</sup> of Mary must have been far greater than this, its liabilities to create false impressions on those who measured its intrinsic depth by expressions which it borrowed from themselves, far greater also. Hence whatever appearances of ignorance or surprise Mary may use<sup>d</sup>, would be very idly urged as any objection to her possession of the knowledge which would be a natural consequence of conception without sin. Indeed, it seems as if this kind of knowledge, acquired as it might be by continued application, i. e. by repeated acts of free-will, would never in itself have made Mary fit to rule God incarnate. For Angels may be conceived to have at least thus much, and yet they sometimes act against the counsel of God from ignorance of futurity. It would seem, as far as we can guess, that Mary would absolutely require some knowledge of futurity, and of the whole depth of God's scheme of salvation, in order to rule Jesus: and in order to this knowledge, would want immense preparatory graces, and antecedent to them, would want a soul, originally free from sin and its blindness, to begin upon. Assuming then the Immunity for true, there is room for free-will to take its ordinary course in the formation of habits by repeated acts. Hence we see why St. Leo speaks of her 'conceiving her divine and human

<sup>c</sup> See vol. i. p. 157.

<sup>d</sup> See above, p. 7. n. i.

Offspring in her mind, before she conceived him in her body :’ how Ephrem or Nazianzen talk of grace presanctifying her, and preparing her for the incarnation<sup>e</sup>, without the least thereby implying that she had any sin to be removed. She required, by the ordinary laws of God’s government, to be advanced by degrees to the dignity of her Maternity. This dignity was so vastly great, that no presanctifying graces would have fitted her for it, if she had not had the whole of her life to prepare for it, unless the law, that habits must be gradually formed by acts which lead to them, had been also abrogated in her regard. If then the Immunity claimed for Mary is against one of God’s laws, viz. the law by which sin is transmitted to all Adam’s posterity, it at all events harmonizes with another law, viz. that by which habits are formed by degrees. No creature could be qualified for the dignity she enjoyed, without a previous discipline of habit. Nor does this make it necessary for St. Joseph also to be conceived without sin, as Mary would serve as an oracle to him, whom he could consult on all occasions. At the same time the reader should be apprised, that it is a pious opinion of some, that St. Joseph may have been sanctified in the womb, though not in his conception<sup>f</sup>.

7. Thus far then it is plain, that the very exemption from one law of God’s government was in conformity with another law. Let us next consider this exemption as such, as an exemption from the law of sin. The reader has been already informed, that it is a Catholic doctrine, that those who are saved, are saved by the predestinating grace

<sup>e</sup> See vol. i. p. 390. n. s. Imm. Conc. and comp. ch. i.

<sup>f</sup> See Bossuet’s Serm. on §. 23.



of God. Now we cannot conceive of the actions of God otherwise than through the medium of our own actions: the workings of our own mind serve to us as types of the Trinity, and though very meagre ones, they are the best we have, and have supplied all our language concerning him. When we discuss divine predestination, these same workings supply our language again, as has been said already, and we speak of the doings of a Being who has no past or future, in words drawn from those of a being who has both past and future. Consequently we are liable to excessive mistakes in the matter; any formulary we can devise for the purpose must always have irreducible expressions in it, which we cannot eliminate from it, except by a second and separate act of the mind. It is calculating eternity by time. This being so, when we have conceived God as planning beforehand to give different degrees of grace to different people, we have immediately after to correct our expression, and to state to ourselves by a distinct act of the mind, that God had no beforehand. Consequently when he made Mary, she was his Mother in his eyes: when he made the Saints, they were Saints in his eyes in some measure: yet not in such measure as Mary was his Mother; for Maternity once given is an inseparable personal property of her that has it, whereas sanctity is a gift which may be revoked.

8. All that we have to go by, if we wish to know whether Mary would differ from the Saints, is the knowledge we possess of other facts and laws belonging to God's government. One of these laws is the law of sin, but this law is a law which has been actually interfered with in such a multiplicity of ways, that we can see directly that there is no arguing from that,



against any one particular exception. Thus, the law of sin has several items in it: one is, that all *conceived* under it shall be sinners, and liable to God's wrath: another is, that they shall all be *born* under his wrath: another is, that they shall all continue in a state of ignorance, and be 'not at all subjects of morality and religion,' during the early part of their brief time of probation for an interminable existence: another is, that after a hundred years, more or less, they shall all have their bodies separated from their souls. Now it is certain, if we do not deny all trustworthy testimony, that all but the first of these has been actually interfered with, and therefore this alone will make it highly probable that the first has also been in some case interfered with. Thus Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and so was Elias; though therefore they are to die at last, they form an exception to the last-mentioned item of the law of sin. St. Nicholas and St. Rose, and other Saints during their infancy, did rational and devotional actions: other Saints again have been, if not as precocious, at least so precocious as to form exceptions to this item of the law of sin. Jeremy was sanctified in some measure, and John the Baptist was *filled* with the Holy Ghost in the womb. The whole law of grace and predestination is one great interference with the law of sin; so great, as completely to crush any evidence the law of sin might be disposed to give against any individual exception. The chances then are in favour of the one remaining exception existing somewhere.

9. However much may be said by some divines against the admissibility of typical interpretations as proof for a doctrine, they certainly do add some weight to evidence drawn from other quarters. Sup-

pose, for instance, our Saviour had not applied the history of Jonas for us, and that the abundant Jewish tradition as to its meaning had no existence: a person might say, what a droll story this is to put into a book pretending to be from God, about a man being swallowed up by a whale, and coming to life again<sup>g</sup>. A Christian might reply, I frankly own it is very hard work to make out satisfactorily, either from Scripture or tradition, that Christ was three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth at all<sup>h</sup>. Nevertheless, if you will take our account of the matter upon trust, you will see it is a theory which will explain why this out-of-the-way story was put into the Bible: it is a wonderful delivery effected by Almighty God on purpose to foreshew something to come, and so we call Jonas a prophet, though there is not an atom of what is ordinarily meant by prophecy in his whole book. In a similar manner I might say; I frankly own it is hard to make clearly out that the Fathers held the Immaculate Conception: nevertheless, if you will take our account of the matter, you will understand why the strange doings of Jael, Judith, and Esther, are put into Scripture at all<sup>i</sup>. Attention is here called to part of the latter story.

10. A certain great king has a hunt to find the prettiest person in his dominions: he prepares her by sundry spices and perfumes for his more immediate

<sup>g</sup>. Lucian appears to ridicule this in his *Veræ Hist.* i.

<sup>h</sup> See Suarez de Resurr. in part 3. D. Thom. vol. ii. p. 486. who will shew what a diversity of opinions Fathers and others have had on this subject, though not the most trustworthy of mortals, for his quo-

tations from the Fathers. See Feuudent ad Massueti *Irenæum*, vol. ii. p. 291.

<sup>i</sup> Several of the remarks made in this chapter may be found in Bossuet's Sermons, on the Immaculate Conception: but they had been said by others before him.

presence, and marries her. Meantime, by a tissue of circumstances I need not relate, he is induced by a favourite to pass a sweeping law for the death of all Jews. The new wife happens to be a Jewess. Does any one, does Haman himself, expect she will suffer? or that the king will not make an exception in her favour? Do you, does Satan himself, expect, that when *the* Virgin comes, she will not be excepted from the sweeping law of sin? I care not here what proofs are necessary for the Church to make her belief a doctrine; but if I said to those without, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign of God's power to exempt from the law of sin be given them, but the sign of the princess Esther—could they, if this were said, complain that we used harsher language than our Lord? The proper proof to the Jews<sup>k</sup> ought to have been, the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees in Moses' seat: the proper proof to you, the teaching of those in St. Peter's seat. The good are warmer in defence of their relations than of themselves: perhaps at the day of judgment Jesus may be warmer in defence of his Mother, than of old in defence of himself. At any rate, you have every reason to expect a singular exception from a law in favour of her, when so many exceptions from the same law had already been made in favour of others. And one cannot help observing, how people flatter themselves that their own is a singular case, and that the rule of God's justice will be relaxed for them. Certainly there have been persons in the Establishment who have seen no better reason for lingering on in schism, than these do for lingering in any other sin. All such persons ought for very

<sup>k</sup> See above, part ii. chap. iii. §. 6.





vilege from the inflictions occasioned by original sin ; it requires no stretch of imagination to suppose, he would make some remarkable exception in her soul's favour also : it does require some stretch of it, to suppose the body exempted without the spirit, the temple of the Holy Spirit sanctified by a wondrous exception, but the soul which animates that temple no better than the soul of the Baptist.

12. Suppose next, that we had no clear proofs of the preeminence of our Saviour's soul above all other souls, still if we knew of his birth being such as no other man's was, we should expect from this external exception to find some internal and corresponding one. We should expect it still more, if we found him an exception to ordinary laws in other cases. When the ministers of the Pharisees answered, 'Never man spake like this man,' they appealed to what was wonderful without, as leading *even them* to be seduced (as the Pharisees put it) to believe what was within. But Mother and Son are correlatives ; we can hardly expect the latter to be exceptional outwardly and inwardly, and not the former : their attributes as well as their persons ought to be correlative in such a remarkable exception, and God ought, as St. Austin said, 'to honour both sexes,' as Satan had dishonoured both. Otherwise, his purpose in appearing at all among men is frustrated : 'for for this purpose did the Son of God appear, that he might destroy the works of the devil<sup>m</sup>.' As then the devil dishonoured the woman first, so God who came to destroy his works ought to honour the woman first. As Eve was created in the image of Adam, so Mary was in the image of Christ, being predestinated according to his

<sup>m</sup> 1 John iii. 8.



image. Male and female created he them: in the image<sup>a</sup> of God created he them, i. e. his own soul and Mary's soul. Without some such view as this, the ancient and Catholic comparison between Eve and Mary is wanting in point and fulness.

13. And here it may be of use to notice an objection which is sometimes made against this kind of argument, and supposed to reduce it to an absurdity. Persons imagine, that Mary at this rate had no need of a Saviour at all: if she was created without sin, and kept that grace, then she had no reason to say, 'and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.' One or two reflections shall be added to what has been said on the subject, with a view to shewing, that this objection is entirely without foundation. In the first place, if Abraham and the prophets were saved by the foresight of Christ's merits, it is beyond a doubt that those merits can act to save men before they had any existence, except in the mind of God. To that mind they are as present now, as they were in Abraham's day: and as present in both, as they were in Pilate's day. *Fecit quæ futura sunt*, is the saying of the Prophet, ever in St. Austin's mouth; he *has* done what is to come. Let alone the question, then, whether the

<sup>a</sup> Whether the words *image and likeness* used in Gen. i. 26. have distinct meanings, is a subject of discussion. To me it seems possible, that a likeness to the Trinity, and a likeness to Christ's humanity, as foreseen to be needful for man's restitution, might be intended. But, of course, after what has been said above, vol. i. p. 393. n. c. I do not mean by this, that God designed to make Christ

before he designed to make Adam: nor think the latter in any way necessary, in order to allow a separate meaning to צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת. But there is no room here to enter into such a wide question.—*Nihil apud me distat in verbo, quod non distat in sensu*, is a rule of St. Ambrose's in interpreting Scripture, to which I am ambitious to cling.

elect Angels became elect by the foresight of Christ's merits, it is at least plain, that the foresight of Christ's merits may have been that which procured Mary the grace of the Immaculate Conception. The union with God was what procured for Christ's own humanity its merits, and not its merits what procured the union: the merits so procured were what procured Mary the sacred immunity, and not the sacred immunity that which procured Christ to be born of her. Take away the idea of Christ out of the divine mind, (as we conceive things,) and the idea of a suitable Mother for him becomes an utter absurdity. The determination to become a Saviour on God's part, involved the determination to have a Mother: he might have created her out of the earth as he did Adam, but he chose that she should be conceived under the same degrading passions (though subdued, as she assured St. Bridgett) as lead to our conception. Still, as he saved her from the consequences of those passions while she was being created, he was her Saviour. If no Saviour had been coming, no Mary would have existed; and yet it became the Creator in making his own Mother to join his saving love to his creating power for once, to shew to man, that though none are saved without the former, yet the latter was not obliged by any fatal necessity<sup>o</sup> to save in the way he has saved, or not at all. Christ then was the Saviour of

<sup>o</sup> Joannes Sarisb. Metal. ii. cap. 13. 'Quia vires naturæ aut nullus pene scrutatur aut rarus, et numerum possibilium solus Deus novit, de *necessariis* plerumque non modo incertum sed et temerarium judicium est. Quis enim novit penitus quid esse possit aut non possit?

Si peperit, cum aliquo concubuit et corrupta est, necessarium esse duxerunt sæcula multa. Sed tandem in fine temporum non necessarium esse, docuit integerrimæ virginis partus.' This remark may not be unprofitable, even in an inductive age.

Mary also: the idea of her Maternity may be considered to be prior in order in the divine mind, to the idea of creating her without sin. Her close and absolutely singular relationship to the Creator having been once fixed upon, he anticipated his work as Saviour: and though his mercy was keeping sabbath still, and the work-days of his wrath were not over, yet he stepped out of his way for his own Mother's sake. Which of you having an ass or an ox fall into the pit on the sabbath day, will not pull him out? which of you having a mother falling, would not prevent it? Judge then of Almighty power with righteous judgment, and do not, under pretence of honouring God the Saviour, do away with his commandment to honour the Mother. Do not make the human lips of Jesus say to Mary, 'That by which thou mightest have been profited by me, is Corban.' You must wait till it is offered<sup>p</sup>.

14. This way of putting the matter will also answer an extraordinarily silly objection which is sometimes made, viz. that if our Lord required a pure source to draw his flesh from, then St. Anne must by parity of reasoning be conceived without

<sup>p</sup> Marc. vii. 11. Κορβάν, ὃ ἐστὶ δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῇθῃς. V. Corban (quod est donum) quodcunque ex me, tibi profuerit. Syr. ܟܪܒܐܢ ܕܥܝܢܝ ܕܥܝܢܝ ܕܥܝܢܝ. In such obscurity of ancient authorities, it is lawful to put the sense on the passage used in the text. Scholz. in his German version has, Korban, das heisst Opfergabe, wovon du von mir Nutzen ziehen könntest. The Syriac might be familiarly rendered, 'Why, my offering (is made),

that you may be profited by me,' which will give a clue to the Latin and Greek: ὠφελῇθῃς τῷ, is, 'to be profited in any respect.' St. Jerome might make κορβάν ὠφ. mean, 'you will be profited by the Corban, whatever comes from me in that way, so I will give you nothing;' which comes to the same sense. Perhaps he had in his Greek ὠφελήσῃ σε: at any rate, his version seems to want an emphasis on the *tibi*.

sin, and so on backwards. For the privilege is here made to depend upon the incommunicable *personal* gift of Maternity: certain things accord with that gift, and if you say St. Anne must be conceived without sin, because (as Catholics assert) Mary was, you might as well assert St. Anne had the same authority over Jesus as Mary had, seeing that authority is involved in the gift of Maternity. It may be well to add, that Catholic divines do not consider St. Anne to be our Lord's grandmother: because his conception was altogether so extraordinary, as not to give St. Anne even that indirect authority over him which goes back to parents of parents. Much less then would they concede her the other personal privileges of the Virgin, who was in all respects a Mother to Jesus. Besides, those who object in this way ought to be reminded, that if God could not cut off the entail of sin at any given point, neither was his own flesh sinless<sup>o</sup>: hence while you try by this argument to pare away with Nestorius the privileges of the Mother of God, Satan may be warily persuading you to advance to the Pelagian doctrine, that Christ had a flesh of sin, and that the war in our members is natural, and not the effect of a fall. Take care, then, lest in trying to refute those who exempt one from its effects, you lend a helping hand to those who wish to exempt all, and make a Saviour more unnecessary than ever. Your argument is; if, according to Catholics, the flesh of God was fittingly drawn only from a pure source, then the flesh of our Lady must also have been drawn from a pure source, and therefore St. Anne too was conceived without sin. The reply is; if, according to protestants, God could not hallow the

<sup>o</sup> See below, chap. vii. §. 9.



flesh of Mary, though taken from a tainted flesh, then the flesh of Mary was tainted, and the flesh which Christ took from her also was tainted. If, on the contrary, he could hallow his own flesh, though taken from what you say was tainted, then he could also hallow the flesh of Mary, though taken from what we confess was tainted; unless you mean to say, that the Almighty was unable, save by the one solitary mode of hypostatic union, to rescue a human flesh from the taint of sin. If the Holy Ghost could do the greater miracle of espousing Mary's flesh, though as you say tainted with sin, then he could do the less one of cutting short that taint.

15. But the objection here spoken of is scarce worth noticing, except as it furnishes an opportunity of pointing out that those who are so far like Nestorius, as to wish to prune away the privileges of the Mother of God, may be under the evil eye of the father of lies: perhaps like a lion, seeking whom he may devour, he is supplying them with wary arguments against the Virgin Seed of the woman that crushed his head, only to induce them or their children more effectually to dispense altogether with the need of a Saviour. As of old, so now, what he wishes is first to strip the Woman of her garment of glory: then to advance to the Man also. If he can once fully and fairly persuade you that it is not likely that God should have forbidden the forbidden fruit to exercise its influence upon Mary, then he will try not long after to make out that the same may be held of Christ also. Some protestants believe already, that God gave us strong passions<sup>p</sup>: here the devil has plainly gotten his work to pass for God's work. Some perhaps think, when Christ

<sup>p</sup> See part i. chap. v. §. 6.



was tempted like as we are, he was tempted by these strong passions also: or if they *do* not think so, why *should* they not, if they think them without sin, in their origin, as well as when not consented to? Here then are certain predispositions for Satan to work upon: if he can persuade you, not other persons, but you, to make much of the argument last considered, remember that very little more will induce you to pass from stripping the woman of her immaculate innocence, to strip the man Christ Jesus also. The blasphemies of Nestorius and of Pelagius are not far asunder. You can have no manner of doubt upon which side Nestorius would have been in the controversy on the Immaculate Conception, had he lived in our days: if Pelagians make a false show of being Catholic on the subject, their real friendship with Nestorius ought to put you upon your guard. There is an old proverb in the East, which may be quaintly rendered thus:

When of good companie bereft thou art, thou art to be,  
Then shalt thou fall, then shalt thou fall, into bad companie<sup>¶</sup>!

When in company with Nestorius, you will leave the company of the saints: you will ultimately be in company with Pelagians, and perhaps help those miserable sceptics of the day, who do not deny a fall only, but the very existence of sin. Either party lie to their own conscience: ‘but to lie to the most important faculty we have, and that on matters most important, no one willingly wishes, but of all things fears to be the owner of a lie there<sup>†</sup>.’

<sup>¶</sup> In the Hitopadesa.

<sup>†</sup> Plato, Rep. ii. §. 20.

## CHAP. V.

UPON THE TENDENCY OF ALL HERESIES TO MANICHEISM, AND  
CONSEQUENTLY TO HATRED OF THE IMMUNITY.

1. IT was suggested at the end of the last chapter, that if we could call up the heretic Nestorius from his place, there could be no reasonable doubt but that he would prove a staunch opponent to the Immunity of the Mother of God. We could conceive Angels to be kept in ignorance of the singular privilege the Church claims for her, till it was on the very eve of being granted, but we cannot conceive them as else than rejoicing upon the announcement of God's intentions: we can conceive devils also as similarly ignorant, but we cannot conceive them as else than bitterly mortified to find their work so completely foiled by God, that not only man was created sinless in Jesus, but woman also who had first fallen was first restored in Mary. What the feelings of devils might be upon such an announcement we cannot indeed be positively certain; but we can make an approximation to it, by considering, what those damned spirits, whom they seduced on earth to be their preachers of heresy, would be sure almost to feel. If the Immunity can be shewn to jar not only with the doctrine of Nestorius, but with that of other heretics, it may be presumed, that if let loose to preach these heresies again, they would be opponents of it. Let us proceed then to summon witnesses from the

enemies' side, and hear what they have to say; the devils could bear witness, that Jesus was the Son of God: why should not other 'blasts from hell' reluctantly proclaim, that Mary his Mother was conceived without sin? We have already endeavoured to shew, that the belief in the Immaculate Conception is in harmony with Catholic teaching: now we are to consider, how far it disagrees with, and is repelled by, that heresy which the Fathers (whom for argument's sake we will suppose ignorant of Mary's privilege) uniformly taught to be the doctrine of devils. What agrees with their admissions and other teaching, that there is a fair chance they would preach now if upon earth: this chance, however, is immensely increased, if the same thing is also at variance with the teaching of the heretics diametrically opposed to them.

2. To consider all heresies one by one in this aspect, would be a task requiring more time and talents and learning than can here be allotted to it. It would be necessary, in order to make their opposition to the pious opinion distinctly out, to state the doctrines of each particular heresy, and the various phases into which, as being error and falsehood, it shifted from the very law of its nature; to prove that certain deductions would follow from such and such portions of each heretical system; and then to state the doctrines, and the deductions from them, upon the Catholic side, and shew, how these last clashed with the heretical side, viewed as repugnant to the Immunity. It would be moreover necessary to consider at length the points in which heresies contradict not only the truth which repels them, but also the opposite heresies. For heresies are commonly found in pairs, one of which is the

opposite of that last developed, if not at bottom, at all events in several material external aspects. And if the sacred Immunity jarred with one extreme only, it would be something in its favour; but it would be more if it jarred with both extremes. For that it does not jar with the mean, so far as the Catholic doctrine of the day holds the place of the mean, is plain. Now-a-days all orders and degrees of Catholics are so swayed in favour of the Immaculate Conception, as to be unable almost to distinguish the degree of tenacity with which their minds cling to it, from the degree with which they cling to articles of faith. The learned Muratori wrote against the Immunity, but under *feigned* names, so little did he feel himself able to appear in his real character before the Catholic public in so doing. If this shews his opposition was out of harmony with the feeling of his own day, the little he was able to produce from the Fathers against it goes to shew that it was out of harmony with that of other days. The fact that he lost one eye a few days before the Feast of the Conception, and the other the next year a few days after that Feast, has looked to some like a judgment of the heavens, which makes them tremble, while it touches them not with compassion. It is fair then to say, that the Immunity does not jar with the mean. To shew fully that it does jar with all the extremes would require either a brightness of thought, actual and not habitual only, at each step taken amongst a vast compass of patristic controversial works, such as few possess, or else a tenacity of memory for all the brightest reflections started by those authors, such as still fewer have ever commanded. Something however may be still done in this direction; if it



has been made plain that the belief in question is a theory, upon which several facts can be explained and harmonized ; if it has been shewn, that it agrees well with Catholic doctrine ; it will be something to shew that it disagrees with a certain number of heretical doctrines, especially if it be the case that it disagrees with conflicting heretical doctrines.

3. It is possible that it may seem presumptuous to summon heretics from hell for the purpose here mentioned, and therefore it is well to add, that they are only assumed to be there upon the strength of their works : no one can say what may have passed between God and their souls at their last breath. The votary of Mary and Ephrem will not forget, that a thief who a while before was blaspheming her Son, was converted by her prayers at his dying hour. Hence he will hope, that similar instances of her mercy may in the next world come to the knowledge of those, who may obtain the vision of her at the last. It may be well also to add the authority of St. Ambrose<sup>a</sup> for a somewhat similar procedure. As he has represented heretics coming one by one before Christ to be judged, what he says of one of them shall be given here. " Let the Manichee say, I believe the devil to be the creator of our flesh. Christ then will answer him thus : What have you to do then among heavenly beings ? Go to your creator. I wish to have those with me, whom the Father has given me. You think, Mr. Manichee, that you were created by the devil. Be quick off then to his dwelling, where is fire and sulphur, where his flame is not extinguished, lest his punishment should ever die." The Saint adds : " But then I, O Lord Jesus, conscious though I be

<sup>a</sup> De Fid. ii. 13.



of heavy sins, shall yet say, I have never denied thee." Moreover, the Lateran Council under Martin the First, and the sixth Council after it, cited a number of passages from heretics, to shew that the Monothelite doctrine agreed with them, as much as it disagreed with the Catholic doctors.

4. It should be further added, that to apply this procedure to the defence of the Immunity of Mary, is no disrespect to St. Bernard, or other great men who may have thwarted the belief in it. For they were known to be ready to submit to the authority of the Church in all things. When the Church has already declared herself in favour of a certain opinion, all arguments may be fairly used to support it. Thus, it might be disrespectful to the predecessors of St. Dionysius of Alexandria<sup>b</sup>, to shew how evil spirits would hate the opponents of the Apocalypse, if the Church had not declared in its favour: or to St. Jerome, to shew how the same spirits would profit by the non-distinction of substance and hypostasis, if the Church had not wrested hypostasis<sup>c</sup> from its Scripture and Pagan sense, to one better adapted to her purposes.

5. It seems then permissible to avail ourselves of the probable feeling of damned spirits towards the doctrine of the Immunity, as a by-proof in its favour. Some few leading heresies then shall be partially examined for this purpose. And let not the unlearned reader suppose, that because incoherent and inconsistent doctrines are put upon heretics, that therefore they must have been misrepresented. For errors of all kinds, in Pagan as well as Christian times, abound with such repugnancies. Neither let it be argued,

<sup>b</sup> Ruinart, p. 186. Vig. Const. Hard. vol. iii p. 37. d,

<sup>c</sup> V. Pet. de Trin. vi. 6,

that because the Immunity does not jar so obviously with some heresies as with others, that the chances are that the whole idea is an idle vagary. But let it first be patiently considered, what is the nature of the attempt here made. Now if it can be shewn, first, that all the heresies here spoken of (and they will be heresies on the Incarnation) tend towards one particular erroneous doctrine, more or less of course, according to the persons who take them up; and next, that that particular erroneous doctrine is in marked opposition to the belief in Mary's privilégé, then this will beget a general presumption at the least, that they are all at bottom at variance with it. Whatever else can be added to shew that the particular heresies considered repel the pious opinion, will increase this presumption: and if it can be made to appear that particular contradictory heresies repel it, this will increase the presumption very much indeed.

6. Now the erroneous notion towards which all heresies seem to tend, is the assertion of two original principles, a good and evil. Some heresies go more directly towards this, and some less: some fall almost by one step into the assertion itself, others go round through some by-path into Manicheism, the great and formal upholder of this assertion. It seems as if the father of lies had a special desire to bring men either directly or indirectly to be as gods, (so to apply his words,) *knowing good and evil*. Hence he seems stealthily to propound to heretics of every kind, principles which will lead them imperceptibly on to some of the tenets of Manicheism, in hopes, as it were, that they will gradually imbibe the whole of the doctrine, and indulge in all vices where matter is concerned with security, while they are convinced

that it can have no permanent effect on spirit<sup>c</sup>. Some have said, that the Fathers point out this tendency, simply because Manicheism was already odious to all respectable Christians, and therefore any resemblance to it, which could be proved to exist in other heresies, would tend to bring odium upon them also. If indeed it had been solely or chiefly in didactic pieces and in sermons that this tendency had been pointed out, then the remark might wear a semblance of truth; but as the passages here alluded to occur chiefly in polemical and dogmatical works, such a mode of accounting for the assertion made by the holy Fathers touching this tendency of heresies to Manicheism, seems so inadequate and unphilosophical, as to lead us to enquire after some profounder account of the matter. Now St. Austin tells us, that “the whole of their raving, with all its fables, flows from the commixture of two natures, a good and a bad<sup>d</sup>.” They attempted therefore to account for all mysteries by a theory of heathen origin, which wears indeed a semblance of being a sufficient exponent of them; but which, if Satan had succeeded in persuading men to yield to, he would soon after have drawn their attention to the fact, that its origin was heathen, and made them draw, as a deduction from this fact, the conclusion, that Christianity was unnecessary.

7. Amongst other mysteries which this heresy seems to explain is the proneness of man to evil: a

<sup>c</sup> The clergy of Apamea, in their letter to the Synod of Constantinople, shrewdly observe of the enormities of Peter Fullo, Hard. ii. p. 1372. a. *Εἰκότως κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν δόξαν πρὸς τὸ κακὸν ἔρρεπε καὶ ἐνικᾶτο τῇ σω-ματικῇ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐπιθυμίᾳ,*

*Καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον πέφυκε Μανι-χαϊκῆς ἀταξίας ἡγείσθαι καὶ τὸ κακὸν ἐνυπόστατον, κ. τ. λ.* But Augustine and Leo have many reflections of the same kind.

<sup>d</sup> c. Jul. Pel. vi. §. 66.

proneness which was attributed by these heretics to the admixture of matter in our system. The fact that we have no existence except through matter, by which our race obtains its continuance, was urged to shew that matter was the cause of evil<sup>d</sup>. To make this theory good, they discarded the Law and the Prophets as too given to material things, and parts of the New Testament also<sup>e</sup>. They considered flesh the creation of the devil<sup>f</sup>, gave brutes a soul which was part of God, whom they thought incarcerated in their bodies<sup>g</sup>, assumed that man had two souls, a rational and an irrational<sup>h</sup>, and made Christ a part of the Father, consubstantial with him<sup>i</sup>. If the last-mentioned error be as truly theirs as matter of fact, as it is naturally theirs as matter of theory, it would follow, that they made all Spirit, God included, in some sense divisible, and so compounded. Hence they would be gliding fast towards the state of the heathen, in whose conception God never rose to any thing beyond a very subtle kind of matter<sup>k</sup>. Now if we take any heresy, however little connected

<sup>d</sup> Aug. Op. imp. iii. 177. 'Nos carnis concupiscentiam, nec substantiam naturæ malæ esse dicimus, quod dicunt Manichæi, &c.' and 212. 'Concupiscentiam carnis, quam malam esse docet Scriptura divina, (per illam quippe caro concupiscit adversus spiritum) vos adjuvantes Manichæos, Deo-æternæ genti tribuere audetis tenebrarum, dum non vultis eam pertinere ad originale peccatum, &c.' See also contr. 2 Epist. Pel. ii. §. 2. cont. Epist. Manich. §. 14. &c.

<sup>e</sup> Vide Ephrem, O. S. ii. p. 550. c. Archel. Casch. e Manet. xli. 1. Leo Serm. p. 34. §. 4. Chrysost. vol. i. p. 699. Didym.

de Trin. p. 383. p. 388. Austin, c. Advers. Leg. et Proph. ubique, cont. 2. Ep. Pelag. iii. 20. Op. imp. vi. 16. de Dono. Pers. §. 26. Epist. 237. §. 2. Fac. Herm. xii. init.

<sup>f</sup> See note d. Amb. de Fid. ii. §. 119.

<sup>g</sup> c. Faust. M. xx. 22. Tit. Bostr. c. Manich. i. 13. 29.

<sup>h</sup> Aug. de duab. Anim. ubique, Op. imp. iii. 172. vi. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Arius ap. Epiph. i. 732. c. Petav. de Trin. v. 8. §. 9. Worm. de Sabell. p. 119. Thomass. de Trin. ii. 7. §. 1. Comp. the next note.

<sup>k</sup> See August. Epist. 118. §. 18. §. 23. §. 25. 136: §. 4. Basil. c. Eunom. i. §. 14. Greg. ibid. ii.



with Manicheism it at first looks, nay even if diametrically opposite to it in outward appearance, we shall find points where they run, and that chiefly through the tendency to Materialism, into the arms of Manicheism. The animating and first principle of Manicheism itself, to wit, the theory of a Dualism, or the theory that there are two original principles, a good and a bad, will prove on a little thought to issue in Materialism. And whatever errors Satan put before men's minds, he seems to have been invariably desirous to secure to himself the power of marching them towards Manicheism: other issues he may have also secured, but this he seems never to have neglected. What is here contended then is, that when the Fathers notice this tendency, it is not as a mere bugbear to frighten the unlearned from other heresies, but from a real conviction that the tendency exists, and is available for Satan's purposes. And what can he desire more than to lead men towards a theory, the very principles of which, by denying that matter is made by God, have ever served in Manichees and in heathens to exempt their votaries from guilt, when through matter they contaminate their souls?

8. In what order it is best to examine the individual heresies, and see how they each evince a tendency to this heresy, must be decided by the exigencies of this work. It may then be as well

p. 327. d. p. 427. a. Nazianz. i. p. 540. Cyril, Dial. p. 506. a. See also Fabricius's notes to Sext. Empir. p. 128. k. l. p. 551 sq. That the heathen called the gods *ἀσώματους* &c. sometimes is allowed: but as even Christians have to make an effort, as St. Austin often notices,

[e. g. in Joan. tr. cii. §. 3. exi. §. 2. de Trin. v. §. 2. viii. §. 3.] to eliminate matter from their minds when contemplating God, this alone makes it plain, that heathens could not without the infused light of faith have divested their god, of matter.



perhaps to examine, first, the heresies of the Euty-chian class, viz. the Apollinarian, Monophysite, and Monothelite heresies, as being the most obviously and palpably connected with Manicheism, and so most easily dispatched<sup>m</sup>. After them, something will be said upon the Arian and Sabellian heresies, as the next fruitful in Manichean tendencies. Then will follow the Nestorians, whose tendencies that way are seldom or never direct, but must pass through other heresies, as Monophysitism or Pelagianism, in order to reach Manicheism. Pelagianism will come next, not only from its relationship to Nestorianism, but also from the expediency of coming back by it to Manicheism, and shewing in how distinct and marked a manner heretics of this latter school must abominate the Immaculate Conception.

9. All heresies have a rude resemblance to orthodox doctrine in this, that their theories come before the world first in a crude and unsystematized form, and afterwards in a more logical and systematical one. Nothing could be more crude and incoherent than the doctrine of Apollinaris as first propounded: yet, nevertheless, we see in it from the first the most palpable tendencies towards Manicheism. Thus Apollinaris asserted the nature of the flesh and not the doings of it to be sin, and consequently was led to assert the unreality of Christ's flesh<sup>n</sup>. So too he would be led to argue,

<sup>m</sup> I wish to acknowledge here the obligation I feel under to Father Newman, for the loan of some private notes upon these heresies. It is not easy to point out distinctly *where* I am indebted to him: and those who know his writings will

easily see, that I should have enough to do, if I made a point of specifying in every instance where I was obliged to him. He best knows, who can best repay him.

<sup>n</sup> Athan. c. Apoll. i. §. 12. fin.

that as Christ is free from sin, he is free from flesh, and therefore not really, but in semblance only, incarnate<sup>o</sup>: that sin was natural, not contrary to nature<sup>p</sup>: and so he would by one phase of his heresy turn towards Arianism, and by another towards Sabellianism or Manicheism. When he objects to giving Christ a rational soul, because the soul is mutable, or substantially sinful<sup>q</sup>, he leads towards Arianism, so far as he thus gives Christ no soul; and towards Manicheism, so far as he makes sin something substantial and inherent in human nature. When he talks of the flesh of Christ as uncreate or heavenly<sup>r</sup>, he leads men directly to imagine with the Manicheans the unreality of Christ's flesh. When he says, that 'if it was real flesh, it had the succession of sin<sup>s</sup>,' he pleases Manicheans and Pelagians at once, as we shall see. When he contends that man consists of three separate *substances*, spirit, soul, and body<sup>t</sup>, he helps the Manicheans towards their belief in two distinct souls, a spiritual and a sensual soul<sup>u</sup>. When again he gave Christ the soul of a brute, and not a rational one, the Manicheans would be ready enough to urge the utility of

<sup>o</sup> Comp. Athan. ad Adelph. cap. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Id. c. Apol. i. l. c. and 14. fin.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. i. 14. Greg. Nyss. c. Apoll. cap. vii. cap. xxvi. cap. xl. Theod. app. Garn. v. p. 397. d. p. 406. d. Eran. p. 23. Shuz. Apoll. in Mai. C. N. vii. p. 70. p. 144. Leont. de Sect. B. P. xi. p. 507. c. Polemon in Lateran H. iii. p. 892. é. Merenda ad Damas. 207. n. d.

<sup>r</sup> Athan. l. c. ad Epict. §. 2. §. 4. Nyssen. l. c. cap. xix. and

xli. Euseb. E. T. iii. 13. 15. Timotheus ap. Mai. Spicil. x. p. 142. Amb. de Inc. §. 50. §. 57. comp. Cyril, Apol. p. 170.

<sup>s</sup> Athan. l. c. ii. 8. below, §. 22.

<sup>t</sup> Nyssen. c. Apoll. xlvii.

<sup>u</sup> Cyril, in Mai. C. N. viii. p. 84. probably means to point out this tendency when he uses the following words: *εἰ τοίνυν, ὡς φασὶν οἱ τῆς αἰρέσεως προστάται ψυχὰς δύο τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἕκαστος ἔχει κ. τ. λ.*

this theory of two souls upon him, as helping his own. The next step would be, to urge that it was unworthy of God to take the sensual or brute soul; because its motions were too palpably carnal, yet too obviously correlative to the flesh, to be severable from a real body. Once give Christ a phantastic body, and it is a very easy step from this to assert, that that, which God could not take into union with himself, was essentially and radically evil: matter therefore is evil, and not from God, but from the devil.

10. Eutychianism was always looked upon as a revival of Apollinarianism in one of its phases. It was a reaction from Nestorianism, and the latter had been always able to represent Cyril and the orthodox party as favourers of Apollinarianism. Policy, confusion of ideas, inability to see that the same words and almost the same arguments might be heretical or orthodox, according to the drift with which they were used,—these and other causes conspired to make the Nestorians<sup>\*</sup> represent the orthodox as in the opposite extreme to themselves. A reaction from Nestorianism then would have a necessary tendency to evolve a heresy akin to Apollinarianism<sup>†</sup>. It is unnecessary therefore to say more of Eutychianism proper. The Monophysites, or Semieutychians as they have been called, were following Apollinaris when they gave Christ but one

<sup>\*</sup> See Garn. ad Merc. ii. p. 301. and comp. Jac. Hom. vi. cap. 6.

<sup>†</sup> Leo, Ep. lix. Non dubie, sicut vobis Sp. S. reseravit, Manichæorum confederantur errore, etc. Above, vol. i. p. 169. &c. Felix ap. Hard. ii.

p. 819. a. Anast. Sin. p. 46. c. p. 95. b. p. 103. d. p. 109. e. p. 128. Grets. Damasc. c. Jacob. 11. Maxent. ii. 23. p. 488. c. Of all these heresies, St. Austin's words may be cited; Qui negat hominem Christum, Manichæus est. Serm. xcii. extr.

nature<sup>a</sup>. This one nature compounded like soul and body out of two, was, they pretended, unconfused and distinct: yet they must, if pressed, have been driven to admit, that we are of the same nature with Christ, and Christ with God; and that we are therefore consubstantial with God, and that the Creator and the creature can therefore become one<sup>a</sup>—a Manichean or Pantheist theory, to which attention will be called presently. If these natures remained unconfused, with different natural qualities, then they did not make one compound nature, but were still two, and the heresy must be given up; if, on the contrary, the difference remained in the qualities only, and not in the things, then by a very few steps<sup>b</sup> we shall come round to the leading Manichean tenet of a phantastic body in Christ. The Monothelites again (if they did not come round to this by their third energy, compounded of the divine and human<sup>c</sup>) are plainly approximating to the Manichean theory of a dualism, when they try to make out that there was no such thing as an individual will, but only two wills, God's and the devil's<sup>d</sup>. Or again, when they give Christ one will only, and yet make this Christ one Person of the Trinity, they give him, who has a created nature, a creative will. His human nature then can create<sup>e</sup>: either

<sup>a</sup> Nyss. l. c. xiii. *Μίαν ἐποίησε τοῦ Θεοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὴν φύσιν*. Theodoret. Eran. l. Leont. ap. Mai. vii. p. 145. *παλαὶ μὲν κ. τ. λ.* Xenaïas ap. Assem. B. O. ii. p. 25. Theod. Rhaith. de Inc. p. 232. Balf.

<sup>a</sup> Quintian ap. Hard. ii. p. 835. Maxim. Conf. ii. p. 193. p. 280. p. 298. Damas. c. Jac. §. 21. Leont. ap. Canis. i. p. 617. and Dub. 19. p. 629. and in Mai. C. N. vii. p. 121. §. vii.

Theod. Abuc. p. 382. a. p. 384. b. p. 391. d. Anast. S. ap. Gretser, xvi. p. 50. b. p. 94.

<sup>b</sup> *Δι' ὀλίγων συλλαβῶν*. Maxim. ii. p. 330. Martin. l. in Hard. iii. p. 736. cf. Anast. Sin. p. 79. c.

<sup>c</sup> Maxim. ii. p. 59, 60. p. 67.

<sup>d</sup> Jo. Damasc. de Duab. Vol. 26. 32. Maxim. ii. p. 12. p. 18. p. 24. p. 38. p. 39, 40. Anast. ap. Mai. C. N. vii. p. 194.

<sup>e</sup> Max. ii. p. 149. p. 160.



then it should be unreal, or what is created can be merged completely into God, and creatures may be absorbed, as the Pantheists say, into the uncreate. But it is needless to insist at greater length upon the manifold aspects, in which these heresies look back to their forefather Manicheism, and tend in one way or other to the adoption of its leading principles, and so to the adoption of that dualism which is its essence.

11. The heresies of the Arian school are certainly not obviously and at first sight connected with Manicheism: we should suppose that they led towards Atheism rather than towards Pantheism. But it should be remembered, that what is here contended for is, not that Arianism necessarily leads to Pantheism, but that it leads to it not unnaturally, and always *may* develope in that direction. Satan offers to all heretics a dilemma one or other of the horns of which they must take, if they cannot return to the truth. The Unitarianism of the present day serves to illustrate what is here meant: Unitarians love to represent God as simple benevolence, are benevolent themselves, hate anathematizing others, often represent hell-fire as not eternal, but only temporal, and unworthy of a benevolent Spirit. Pantheists in these respects would feel a drawing towards them, and they to Pantheists. Yet certain as, to a person acquainted with the modes of thought occurring in Pantheistic writers, these indications of Pantheistic tendencies would seem, they are not obvious points of attraction between the two, and might require a great deal of space to state and explain them fully. The same then may be the case with ancienter schools of Arianism. Of these there were three main divisions, Arianism proper, and Semi-Arianism, and



Ultra-Arianism, or Eunomianism. To the latter the first naturally tended. Eunomius was acuter<sup>f</sup> than Arius, and only worked his system more fully out to its consequences. Eusebianism, or Semi-Arianism, where the counteracting influences of fear of the world, or of renascent orthodoxy, did not interfere with its growth in the soul, also culminated naturally in Ultra-Arianism<sup>g</sup>. Arianism so far from denying, absolutely disliked denying in words, that the Son was very God<sup>h</sup>: hence they called him a creature, but not as one of the creatures<sup>i</sup>. Eunomius, on the contrary, so openly and nakedly called him a creature, that Nyssen and others<sup>k</sup> seem to make it *the* characteristic of his heresy.

12. Now of these phases of Arianism, it is not the least developed, but the most so, which comes nearest to the dualism of the Manichees. This is much to be observed, as it alone would shew to what the least developed ultimately tended. The Eunomians, or Ultra-Arians, made the essence of the Father to lie in his being ingenerate, and the essence of the Son to lie in his being generate<sup>l</sup>. This *might* have an orthodox meaning enough, if by the terms 'Father' and 'Son' were meant two distinct persons, of a nature numerically one. But as with them this was not the case, and the terms did not mean two persons only, but two separate and disjointed natures,

<sup>f</sup> 'Eunomius in dialectica prævalens acutius et celebrius defendit hanc hæresin.' Aug. de Hær. liv. Jo. Dam. H. 76.

<sup>g</sup> See Newman ad Athan. p. 103. n. t. Merenda ad Damas. p. 209. an. iii. and iv.

<sup>h</sup> Bened. ad Hil. de Trin. viii. §. 3. a. Vigil. c. Eut. in B. P. vol. iv. p. 1. p. 520. a. Fulgent. Tras. Reg. lib. i. cap. 7. Volentes

Deo Filio *naturam* veri nominis adimere cui nequeunt *nomen* naturalis veritatis auferre.

<sup>i</sup> N. on Athan. p. 10. n. u.

<sup>k</sup> Vol. ii. p. 308. d. Cyril in Jo. p. 29. c. Anast. Sin. p. 42. a. Gretser. Comp. August. de Trin. xv. §. 38.

<sup>l</sup> Nyssen. ii. p. 389—94. p. 690—1. Bas. c. Eun. p. 283. b.

the one created and the other uncreate, they make the essence of the one nature the opposite of the essence of the other. Now this is faulty, not only in theology, but even in logic: for one essence cannot be opposite to another. To admit such a principle is to desert Aristotle, so far as he makes essences incapable of being opposed, and to help the cause of Manes, who assumes that evil is substantial in the same sense that good is. Eunomianism then introduces two first principles with contrary attributes, and so is like Manicheism, or rather is worse than it, in that with the latter they really are first principles and coeternal, whereas Eunomianism makes the good Ingenerate *create* his opposite generate. This is what Eunomianism, if followed out, must lead to: and the other phases of Arianism, leading not unnaturally to it, would also lead to the same result.

13. But as men would recoil, upon reflection, from making God create his contrary, i. e. evil, they would either take up with Manicheism at once, or find some other defence for the Ultra-Arian theory. Now it is possible that they might try to insist still upon the negative characteristic 'Ingenerate,' which they had given to the Son's Maker, as the Father in the Arian theory is. It might be that they would argue thus: other creatures, so far forth as they are creatures, and considered in this respect alone, are diametrically opposite to the Uncreate: yet *they* are not opposite, in consequence, to the Uncreate in all his qualities; therefore the Son or Word need not be. This might be a very fair argument for persons who considered uncreatedness and createdness to be attributes of an essence, and not as the Eunomians make them, the very essence

itself of their Gods. For they maintained stoutly, that they could understand what an essence was, and no doubt would have denied Transubstantiation, from supposing they could understand all essences, God's not excepted<sup>m</sup>. They could not then say, that because other creatures are like the Son's Maker, therefore the Son, though his opposite in Essence, is like him: to do so, would be at once to make God compounded of essence and attributes as creatures are. Creatures (it might be replied to them) are only like God, because they have certain attributes like his. What you know of his attributes, and what you know of theirs, leads you to trace a resemblance: but it is absurd to create an essence opposite the Creator's as you do, and then assume that this essence will be like him in attributes, though his opposite in essence. To adopt your absurd hypothesis, that one essence *can* be contrary to another; suppose immateriality could be the essence of man, and man made a hammer, and with it made a cauldron; would it follow, because man has certain attributes in common with the cauldron, such as capacity for containing solids or fluids, that therefore the hammer also possesses these attributes? Rather the effect of such speculations would only be to lead men round by another road to Manicheism. For from likeness of attributes they would be led, whether you will or no, to assume identity of substance, and to deny identity of origin to that matter, which prevented man from realizing his oneness with God. It is a pantheistic theory, that God

<sup>m</sup> Basil, c. Eunom. i. §. 12. in reply to this, asks: "What then is the essence of earth? What the mode of compre-

hending it? Let them tell us, if it is reason that reaches it, or sense? and if sense, which sense?" &c. &c.

is all spirits, and all spirits are God<sup>n</sup>, and it naturally leads to the assumption that the matter which interferes with the absorption of all things into God, is not from God, but from another cause. Men then, with Eunomian theories before them, might be led in this way also towards Manicheism.

14. If these thoughts be suggested by the acute Nyssen's dissection of Eunomius's principles, they are confirmed by the observations of other Fathers made upon the evasions of Scripture put forth by the Arians. Arianism made the Image of the Father in the Son to be a moral resemblance, such as creatures are capable of. Hence they too might become God in any sense that he is God<sup>o</sup>. Arians, again, had such modes also of evading the texts of Holy Writ which told against them, as would be highly favourable to Manicheism. They applied such terms as 'made' and the like to the Son, whom Scripture calls God. Hence Manicheans might say, if 'made' may be used of God, what is there in such texts as state that 'God *made* the heaven and the earth, and all therein<sup>p</sup>,' to gainsay the pantheist doctrine that God *is* all things? Of course, people of sane belief would say, that the subject-matter of such a passage precludes the possibility of these being God. But Manichees might appeal to the common consent of the majority of heathen, who believed that the subject-matter did not at all preclude such a notion. The Manichees, with such principles of interpretation, might abandon

<sup>n</sup> 'Who dost include all natures as the sea its waves.' Wordsworth, Despondency Corr. p. 118. This is a simile in use with Indian Pantheists. See Windischman Philosophie im F. &c. i. p. 1443.

<sup>o</sup> Cyril, Dial. p. 394. e. ἀπείρξε γὰρ ἂν οὐδὲν, ἐπεὶ γε ἔχει κατὰ τὸ ἀληθές, τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμᾶς εἶναι φύσεως τῷ δημιουργῷ.

<sup>p</sup> Athan. c. Ar. ii. 11. Ambr. de fide iii. 42.



their objections to the books of the Pentateuch, and when we shall have persuaded the whole population of Asia, that our Scriptures are the true Revelation, if God can be said to make God, they may still, for all their receiving the Bible, assert that God is all things and all things are God, that to a discriminating<sup>9</sup> mind, matter is either an unreality, or, if abandoning this as too fanciful, is a creation of an opposite creator.

15. Semiarianism too might find itself driven on to Arianism, and Arianism to Ultra-Arianism, in some such manner as this. But it is important to observe, in confirmation of the relationship here asserted to exist, that heretics of the Eutychian school very frequently became Arians, or in some way heterodox on the Trinity. Eutychians and Apollinarians are naturally connected: and Apollinarians and Arians are like each other, in so far as neither of them really give Christ a human soul. But there is also a phase of Arianism which connects it not only with Manicheism, but also with Sabellianism, of which we are next to say something. That phase is the one in which it occurs as driven to adopt the heathen notion of the expansion and contraction of the Deity<sup>r</sup>. Through the medium of this notion, Arianism fits on to Sabellianism, and to some theories which were probably offshoots of the latter.

<sup>9</sup> Colebrook, *Essays*, i. p. 237-42. Windisch. l. c. p. 1626. Wilson's *Sanscrit Lex.* in v. *Vijnana*, and *Ahancára*, Morris, *Essay*, &c. p. 318. n. 49.

<sup>r</sup> Nyssen. ii. p. 644. c. αὐτὴν τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἐν παρατάσει τινι διασθηματικῇ θεωρεῖν, μόνων τῶν τὴν νεὰν σοφίαν πεπαιδευμένων ἐστὶ. Germanus Const. in Mai. *Spicil.* vii. p. 11. speaks of Sabellius as ἀνάποσιν τινα καὶ κατὰποσιν ἐπιτηδεύσας νομοθετῆσαι, — and making God ἐξαπλουμένον (l.

ἐξηπλωμένον) πάλιν συστέλλεσθαι. Athan. c. Ar. Athanas. O. T. p. 528. mentions the Stoics as the authors of this notion. See the notes there, and Petav. de Trin. v. 6. §. 61. Aug. de Trin. ii. §. 25. and Epiph. H. 76. §. 6. p. 919. ascribe it apparently to Arians. It is a common notion in the East. See Manu. i. 5. 54. Bhag. Pur. i. 2. l. 30. Wilson ad Vish. P. p. 8. n. 2. and in v. Pralaya.



16. Sabellianism, when regarded as the antithesis of Arianism, lay, it seems, in making the Father Son and Holy Spirit one person viewed in different lights, whereas Arianism lay in making them three separate substances. Now the attempt to shew that three Persons really distinct were one, would necessarily lead to sophisms, highly favourable to those who wanted to prove that all things were one, stones, trees, men, and animals, all being in the Manichean view really animated with the incarcerated Deity<sup>a</sup>. Or again, this attempt might lead to confusions between 'Person,' and 'Nature,' favourable to Monophysitism<sup>t</sup>. But the reader should also keep in mind, that a wrong theory upon the Trinity, necessarily led to a wrong theory upon the Incarnation. Arius held the Word to be Christ's spirit or soul, and a Sabellian must have been led to hold, either that God was in Christ as a mere operation, or that the flesh was an unreality. That the Father suffered, was but a modification of the former view, the idea of Christ's absorption into God, a modification of the latter. The similarity of some Apollinarian theories upon the Trinity to Sabellianism<sup>u</sup> farther confirms this idea. Great as the confusion is about the history of Sabellianism, there must have been a Patripassian form of it<sup>x</sup>, and it admits in this form of comparison with a notion entertained by some Manichees, that the Holy Ghost suffered on the Cross<sup>y</sup>. But it would more naturally lead to a different kind of

<sup>a</sup> See above, p. 315. n. g. and comp. Aug. c. Faust. Man. xv. 4. xvi. 9.

<sup>t</sup> St. Anast. Sin. p. 48. p. 64. c. Max. ii. p. 59. and others notice this.

<sup>u</sup> Basil, Epist. 265. §. 2. Naz. ad Cledon. p. 744. Epiphan.

H. 62. init. See also on St. Ephrem, O. T. p. 166. n. d.

<sup>x</sup> Leo ad Turib. Ep. xv. p. 697. August. Hær. 41. &c.

<sup>y</sup> Felix. iii. ap. Hard. ii. p. 822. p. 826. c. and e. Aug. in Jo. tr. xcix. §. 2. See further on Ephrem, 300. a.

theory upon the Incarnation. Sabellius is condemned with Photinus and Marcellus in the first Canon of Constantinople<sup>a</sup>. Now Marcellus's heresy denied the eternity of Christ's flesh when once taken, and caused the addition to the Creed of the words, 'Cujus regni non erit finis.' Alluding apparently to this, Nazianzen says, "God will be all in all at the time of the restitution; not that the Father will be all in all, because the Son is absorbed into him, like a torch into a great funeral pile, taken from it for a while, and then put back to it again, (and let not the Sabellians foist themselves in here,) but the whole of God will be so<sup>b</sup>." And Cyril, writing against Apollinarianism, says more plainly, "From this text<sup>b</sup>, Arius and Eunomius receive a severe reprimand for their blasphemy; and Sabellius and Marcellus and Photinus, who deny the three hypostases, and confuse the proprieties of the Godhead, are also convicted of blasphemy<sup>c</sup>." And presently Cyril says, "Apollinaris too, with Arius and Eunomius, is taught, that the Immutable God, the Word, was not changed into the nature of flesh, but brought about our salvation owing to having taken our substance."

17. Hence we see, that there are an abundance of roads by which Sabellianism might find its way to Manicheism. If Christ's body was, according to a disciple of the Sabellian school, absorbed into God at the consummation of all things, why should not other spirits be absorbed into him<sup>d</sup>? If this be

<sup>a</sup> Hard. i. p. 809. Catalani, i. p. 169.

<sup>b</sup> Naz. i. p. 581. παραφ. I have no doubt should be παρ-εσφθερέσθωσαν.

<sup>c</sup> Phil. ii. 6, 7.

<sup>d</sup> ap. Mai. Coll. Nov. viii. p. 68. See further, Worm. de

Sabell. cap. ii. §. 7. vii. §. 15. Newman ad Athan. Or. iv. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. E. T. iii. cap. 15. p. 184. a. ἀκόλουθον ἂν εἴη . . . . μηκέτι εἶναι τὸν Υἱὸν καθ' ἑαυτὸν, μηδὲ τὰ ὑποταγησόμενα αὐτῷ, . . . . συναλοιφήν δὲ τινὰ καὶ σύγχυσιν γίνεσθαι τῶν ὄλων. κ. τ. λ.

admitted, would it not be an easier theory to adopt, to assume its unreality at once? Or, if personal distinctions are confounded in the Trinity, will you not help those who wish to make out that they are unreal among creatures? The same arguments, so far as they go, which will prove the former, will also help to prove the latter, fanciful as such a denial may appear. In confirmation of this it may be observed, that when a celebrated Indian, Pantheist<sup>e</sup>, retraced his steps from his native philosophy towards Christianity, he took up with a Sabellian theory of the Trinity, as most conformable to his preconceived notion of the deceptiveness of all ideas of separate personality in creatures. The steps from this to a dualism are easy: either the ideas of matter and of separate personality are deceptions, and then there is a deceiver at work against the good Creator: or, if they are realities, and interfere so necessarily with union with him, then there is a bad creator which made them.

18. Here then we see that two heresies, which though diametrically opposite in their outward and tangible shape, are yet inwardly conscious of the guilt of aiming at the establishment of a dualism. They are so opposite, that even Basil accused<sup>f</sup> Dionysius of Alexandria of running into Ultra-Arian expressions, in combating Sabellianism: and his brother says, that ‘these two opinions are set like two gins by Arius and Sabellius, and that between them there goeth a certain strait and narrow way which leadeth unto life, as the Gospel has it; out of which way the *generality* of men stray, and become the victim of the one or the other<sup>g</sup>.’ This is one

<sup>e</sup> Ram Mahun Rai.

Athan. pro Sent. D. §. 13.

<sup>f</sup> Epist. ix. §. 2. ibiq. Bened.

<sup>g</sup> c. Ar. et Sabel. init. ap.

case then of opposite heresies tending to the same dualism. Now Nestorianism may be regarded as the antithesis of Apollinarianism or Eutychianism. It is therefore directly opposite to that school of heresy, which is most clearly of the Manichean class. Nestorianism, moreover, upon the whole kept itself from avowed heresies upon the Trinity, except perhaps that upon the Double Procession<sup>h</sup>, a heresy on the Incarnation not necessitating one upon the Trinity. What is said then of any direct tendency of Nestorianism to Manicheism, will be meagre and unsatisfactory: it will be chiefly through the medium of other heresies, that its contact with Pantheism appears not unlikely to take place.

18. It may, however, be as well to say what little can be said upon the direct tendency of the one towards the other. The Manichean notion of the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit is not without some countenance from Nestorianism. The Nestorian theory reduces the union of Christ's soul with God to a level with that of the Spirit with the saints, so far as to take from it the utter difference in kind, that the hypostatic union gives it. Why again does it recoil so from making man one hypostasis with God? is it simply and solely the rebellion of the proud intellect against the reception of a mystery? or does there lurk at the bottom of it some half-recognised aversion to flesh, as if essentially evil, and unworthy of the Creator? Is not this a suggestion which Satan might put before a Nestorian, if he thought he could thereby be led to believe

Mai, vol. viii. p. 1. Walchius, in his *Ketzer Historie*, ii. p. 28. allows that ancient authorities justify the assertion of this antagonism.

<sup>h</sup> See part i. chap. iii. §. 9. Mercator was over-subtle in accusing Nestorius of Manicheism. See Garnier, ii. p. 305-6.



gradually in a Dualism? What do Nestorians<sup>1</sup> feel when they argue, that God became flesh in the same sense as he became a curse? Or again, when they argue, that an uncircumscribed God cannot become one with circumscribed matter, what is this but putting spirit and matter under the same category, and attributing to the former a relation to space and to measure like that which the latter has<sup>k</sup>? The Nestorian theory, as more systematically stated in the writers<sup>1</sup> cited by Leontius, certainly seems to indicate a strong tendency to Materialism. The Person of Christ is a compound Person, not a compound Nature in the Catholic view. In opposing this, Nestorians argued from existing and known compositions against the possibility of such a composition. They argued as if things are what they are by some fatality, and not by God's will: as if therefore existing compositions must be the measure of possible ones. From this it would follow, that if, as they thought, all actually existing subsistencies were composed of pre-existing parts, that all things must have been formed out of pre-existing matter<sup>m</sup>, and so on backwards. Hence God could not in the end of time introduce a new and wholly unpre-

<sup>1</sup> Vide J. Damasc. i. p. 556. d.

<sup>k</sup> Leont. c. Nest. i. 5. Maxent. Dial. 2. init. Mopsuest. ap. Rab. (Hard. iii. p. 432. b.) it seems originated this; for he assigns as the Word was united only *bonâ voluntate quædam*—*tantumquam divina natura non suscipiente alterum modum sint propter incircumscriptibilem*: for that this is not Rabulas's own deduction seems plain from the fact, that Nestorius himself anathematized those who make the flesh coextensive

with the infirmity of the uncircumscribed nature to make it hold God. Anath. ii. ap. Hard. i. p. 1299.

<sup>1</sup> Mai. Præf. ad vol. ix. C. N. §. viii. p. xiv. Sane intererat scire ex quibusnam nominatim sectæ discipulis aut doctoribus tot objectiones Leontius haus erit; sed quia is nomina reticet, cogitandum est de *pluribus* illis Nestorianorum Scriptoribus quos recenset Ebedjesus, etc.

<sup>m</sup> Leont. c. Nest. ap. Mai. C. N. ix. p. 417. extr. cf. p. 472. c.



cedented composition, such as the compound Person of Christ involved. Such a theory then would be favourable to Manicheism, because favourable to Materialism, with which it is so closely connected. Nestorianism therefore, when it tries to defend itself, is driven towards Manicheism even against its will.

20. But it is chiefly through its Monophysite and Monothelite tendencies, that its tendency to Manichean principles is observable. To make this intelligible, the reader may be reminded, that in the controversies upon the Trinity one principle of Church philosophy (so to style it) which was strongly brought out was this, that ‘things of the same essence have the same operation, and things of the same operation have the same essence’<sup>a</sup>. Therefore to assert that two things have the same operation, is to assert that they have the same nature, and conversely, whoever asserts of two things that they have the same nature, does thereby either assert that they have the same operation, or else abandon this piece of Church Philosophy. If the three Persons of the Godhead did not do all the divine operations Christ did in the flesh, there is a difference of nature in those Persons: if the Father or Holy Ghost were crucified, they took flesh, and did the human operations as much as the Son did. If Christ has not two operations or energies, a divine and a human also, then he has not two, but only one nature. To assert that he has but one operation, is to assert that he has one nature. Deny that this assertion and that are equivalent, and then you abandon the premiss absolutely necessary to

<sup>a</sup> Maxim. c. Pyrrh. p. 192. καὶ ἐδίδαξαν τὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ὄντα πάντα εἶναι, διαρρήδην κοινῇ καὶ εἰπὼν οὐσίας, κ. τ. λ.

prove from Revelation that the three Persons are one God.

21. Now a Monothelite is a person who ascribes but one compound operation to Christ: a Monophysite ascribes to him one compound nature: either heresy necessarily and 'ex vi termini' involves the other. Any heresy then which asserts but one operation in Christ, necessarily and 'ex vi termini' asserts but one nature. To hold the one and not to hold the other is to abjure, either rationality, or the philosophy of the Church. When it is said people are often better than their principles, this is true in charity: but such a remark is out of place here. Here the question is, whether Satan, who teaches 'the doctrine of devils' to heretics<sup>o</sup>, has secured himself any road whereby to lead Nestorians to Manicheism. Now the Nestorians held that both persons in their Christ deserved divine worship; in order to uphold this man-worship, they made the human person in their Christ of equal dignity to the divine; if he has equal dignity, his will and other operations must be coextensive. This too they asserted. Hence we find it said, that Severus, the great Monophysite doctor, was a disciple of the man-worshipper Nestorius<sup>p</sup>. Or it is said, that Severus and Nestorius have but one aim, though they take different modes of getting at it, and that aim is to make one will to both natures<sup>q</sup>; or again, Nestorian heretics are quoted

<sup>o</sup> This is the universal opinion of the Fathers. See on Athan. p. 9. n. s. and on Ephrem, p. 326. e.

<sup>p</sup> Epist. Episc. Orient. c. Anth. et Sever. in Hard. ii. p. 1220. b. cf. p. 1318. e. Max. Aquil. ibid. iii. p. 846. d. p. 851. b. Compare Mart. ibid.

p. 770. b. Maxim. Conf. ii. p. 103. Leont. ap. Canis. i. p. 578. xxi. e. Monoph. ap. Mai C. N. vii. p. 115. p. 121. Theod. Abuc. p. 328. Anast. Sin. p. 15. p. 141. &c.

<sup>q</sup> Max. conf. ii. p. 27. p. 95. comp. p. 20. p. 186. p. 329.

as anticipating Monothelite doctrine<sup>r</sup>. Many other points might be noticed, where an internal agreement of principles existed between heretics, who anathematized each other, whose logic and theology were, if we consider them as opposite parties, often equally absurd<sup>s</sup>. But still it has, it is hoped, been made plain, that the very principle of sameness of operation in the two persons of the Nestorian Christ which is essential to their system, is a principle directly tending to the heresies of the opposite school, and so enabling Satan to drive a consistent Nestorian towards Manicheism. It seems that even Gregory the Divine saw from the first the tendency of Apollinarianism to diverge towards some heresy of the Nestorian class<sup>t</sup>. Nor are Nyssen and Athanasius wanting in passages, where this tendency is noticed<sup>u</sup>.

21. But the connection between Monophysitism and Nestorianism, palpable though it may seem, is yet not so palpable as the connection of the latter with Pelagianism. It is worth introducing the remark here, that as Pelagianism *and* Nestorianism both lower Christ to the condition of others, both speak, if at all, in a heretical sense, of his predestination<sup>v</sup>; so the

<sup>r</sup> In Conc. Lat. p. 896. c. Max. Vol. ii. p. 91. p. 94. p. 183. Anast. Caten. de Inc. in Mai. Coll. Nov. vii. p. 68. Rust. Diac. p. 813-4. And so the 'una virtus' of Ibas was looked upon as a note of Nestorianism. Fac. Herm. vii. init.

<sup>s</sup> Assem. diss. de Monoph. B. O. ii. p. xiv. In his quæ ad Monothelitismum spectant, Jacobitas qui unam Christi naturam unamque voluntatem astruunt, non malos dialecticos dixeris, sed malos theologos: Monothelitas vero, qui duas naturas et unicam voluntatem

agnoscunt, malos theologos malosque dialecticos: Nestorianos autem, qui duas naturas duasque personas admittentes unam iis voluntatem operationemque tribuunt, pessimos theologos et pessimos dialecticos.

<sup>t</sup> Fragm. ap. Mai. vii. p. 64. ἴσον γὰρ τι πταίουσιν ἐξ ἐναντίας, κ. τ. λ. I give this iambic as a specimen, in hopes that some good Samaritan of a critic may turn out of his way to pour in a little metre and sense into the passage.

<sup>u</sup> See above, vol. i. p. 194.

<sup>v</sup> See part i. chap. vii. §. 1.

Monothelites evinced a tendency towards the thoroughly Pantheistic theory of a preexistence<sup>w</sup>. All three heresies might on this point easily come to an agreement favourable to a subsequent alliance with Manicheism. But it has been shewn in the First Part, in what a number of ways Nestorianism fits on to Pelagianism: and though Nestorius found it advisable to preach against Pelagius' doctrine of original sin, there is yet such a strong affinity between the two heresies, as to leave very little doubt upon the mind that he would not long have held out against Pelagius upon this point also. Pelagianism, on one side, forms a close contact with Manicheism: on the other, it acts magnetically upon Nestorianism, as if upon a chain, the majority of whose links it had already drawn to itself. Let us proceed then to see how two heresies, apparently as much opposed as fatalism and free-will, can yet have strong latent affinities.

22. That Manicheism is diametrically opposed to Pelagianism there can be no doubt, not only from the fact, that Pelagians accused Catholics of Manicheism<sup>x</sup>, but also from the distinct admission of St. Austin himself. Nevertheless, the child of St. Monica's prayers hesitates not to assert, that the Pelagians were the best friends the Manicheans could have wished for. "What," he says, "does a Manichean like to hear said as much as that evil things cannot come from good? for as the existence of evil things cannot be denied, the only course open is to assume that they *do* come from evil, if

<sup>w</sup> See Rustic. Diac. B. P. iv. pt. i. p. 810. d. Nonnullos habetis ita dicentes et *consequens est vestro dogmati*, ut ista dicatis,

sicut postea ostendetur.

<sup>x</sup> Aug. de Nupt. et C. ii. §. 38. Op. imp. v. 25. Garn. ad Merc. i. p. 269.



they cannot come from good<sup>r</sup>." The chief means by which Julian tried to shew that Catholics were Manicheans, was by confusing good as a nature or substance, and good as a quality. As a nature, the devil is good, man is good: it is the qualities they have which make them bad. Hence Julian took from Scripture two premisses, in one of which good is used in the former, in the other in the latter sense, and by the help of this ambiguous middle drew his false conclusion. Every creature of God is good, was one premiss; and, A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, was another. From this he inferred, that man, being a creature of God, and good, brings forth good fruit, and therefore that children are not evil, and not born in sin. It is plain, that the Manichean would easily avail himself of the same ambiguity to prove an evil, as well as a good first cause. Evil exists unquestionably, he would say: but evil cannot come from good, therefore it comes from evil, and original evil from an originally evil cause<sup>s</sup>. Here the same fallacy is used to prove the opposite heresy to Pelagianism. The other points of resemblance between the two heresies are but little more than illustrations of this fallacy. For instance, death was not introduced by sin, says the Pelagian, but by the law of nature: the pains<sup>a</sup> of

<sup>r</sup> c. Jul. Pel. i. §. 38.

<sup>s</sup> c. Jul. Pel. i. §. 38. vi. §. 66. Op. imp. iii. 177. iv. 123. v. 41. 54. &c. St. Austin had pointed out long before the Pelagian controversy the use of a similar distinction against the Manicheans. Sermon. 12. §. 2. John Dam. c. Jacob. §. ii. shews how the Monophysite confusion of hypostasis and substance might lead to the same confusion as

that which Julian availed himself of. And the same may be said of the Monothelites. See Council. vi. Act. viii. p. 1182. and Athan. c. Apoll. ii. §. 10. there alluded to. See also Max. ii. p. 38—40.

<sup>a</sup> Aug. Op. imp. i. §. 67. iii. §. 154. 158. 177. v. §. 22. 23. where he speaks of Julian as filling 'Paradisum Dei etiamsi nemo peccasset, libidinibus con-



babes and children, and their mental and moral deformities, were not to be explained by a belief in original sin according to him, but were results of the law of nature: therefore as far back as the history of our race goes, they existed; they were in Paradise, if sin did not introduce them; they existed at the very first. But the Pelagian has ruled it, that evil cannot come from good; therefore they were not from a good Creator, but from a bad one; unless you can persuade men, that these evils, which, they see, are so increased by actual sin, are not evils, and have no natural connection with sin. Again, if these evils are found in 'innocent' children, as Pelagius would call them, and they are not the punishment of original guilt, it follows either that God is unjust for punishing the innocent<sup>b</sup>, or that there is another first cause from which these evils come.

24. The Manicheans again had argued, that without the evil, lust, man could not be brought into being<sup>c</sup>: but the Pelagian says, this belongs originally to man's nature: all men have it: Christ had it. With this the Manicheans would join the plain undeniable fact, admitted by heathens as well as by Christians, that lust and reason are always opposite to each other, that the one comes into the presence of our consciousness almost as soon as the other is

cupiscentium, certaminibus contra libidines dimicantium, doloribus parturientium, fletibus vagientium, morbis languentium, funeribus morientium, mœrore lugentium.'

<sup>b</sup> Theodore seems (from Leont. ap. Can. p. 578. xxiii.) to have held, that Adam's fall was managed by God, that he (God) might have an opportunity of displaying his re-

deeming power: (cf. Vigil. Const. p. 33. c.) this perhaps led him to look for an explanation of the fall of Angels, and to assume that God either created some of *them* to manage Adam's fall with, or else that there were princes of darkness not of God's creation. See Leont. l. c. and in Mai. Spicil. x. part ii. p. 76.

<sup>c</sup> See above, p. 315. n. d.

at all mature<sup>d</sup>. Here then again Pelagians are lending a helping hand to Manicheans. What Manicheans wish to establish is, the existence of two original conflicting principles. The Pelagians step in and say, we were created with lust; but lust is a principle the opposite of reason, suspending the energy of reason when it energizes, and marring its vigour when used, destroying it when used in excess. St. Austin<sup>e</sup> moreover has shewn acutely, that as we had not known sin, except by the law which orders us to resist concupiscence, the law and concupiscence are antagonist principles. The Manichee says, the law was not from God: the Pelagian, that concupiscence was from God. Either party, by establishing his premiss, will help the other, and explain the antagonism between lust and law<sup>f</sup>. If then this was<sup>g</sup> created in us, it could not, in St. Austin's view, have been created by a just God. The Pelagians then cannot maintain their doctrine of original sin, without most materially assisting the cause of Manicheism. Let it be remembered also, that this assertion of the existence of lust in man's original nature, led them to assert the existence of it in Christ himself. 'The Manichees,' says St. Austin, when contrasting the two heresies, 'strip Christ's flesh of its honour, blaspheming the birth of the

<sup>d</sup> A. Op. imp. iii. 178. Ut quisque ratione uti cœperit, si concupiverit castitatem, concupiscentiam carnis, quæ fuerit ætate sopita velut evigilantem repugnantemque jam sentit.

<sup>e</sup> Serm. 26. §. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Apollinaris ap. Greg. Nyss. cap. vii. makes this antagonism the reason why Christ's flesh must have the brute soul. οὐκ ἄψυχος ἡ σὰρξ· στρατεύεσθαι γὰρ

κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔργηται κ.τ.λ.

<sup>g</sup> De Nat. et G. §. 3. Vitium quod ista naturalia bona contenebrat et infirmat, ut illuminatione et curatione opus habeat, non ab inculpabili artifice contractum est, sed ex originali peccato. De Nupt. &c. l. i. §. 26. Non quod *ab illo* [i. e. a diabolo] est humana natura quæ non est nisi ex Deo, sed vitium quod non est a Deo.

Virgin; and the Pelagians, by making the flesh of those to be redeemed equal to that of the Redeemer<sup>h</sup>. The Pelagian doctrine of original sin then, which Nestorius affected to abjure, was necessary to make the Pelagians his friends. For the point on which the two heresies were agreed, was the doctrine of human merit: but this doctrine could not be maintained, unless Christ had a sinful<sup>i</sup> flesh: unless our nature was originally sinful, inherently and necessarily lustful. Christ, in their system, plainly was no example to us, unless he had the same temptations to fight with: it was the *example* of Adam which led to sin, and that of Christ which led to virtue, according to the Pelagians; there was no internal curse necessary to explain the sinfulness in the one case, or real internal grace to explain the sanctification in the other. If, therefore, Nestorians were to be friends with Pelagians, they would be driven by degrees to admit the existence of lust<sup>k</sup>, as an essential principle of human nature, and so they too would (if circumstances permitted them to reflect) be led round to the existence of two conflicting principles. It is of no great consequence to consider, whether Nestorians actually did follow out their principles in this way: for the main thing here attempted is to shew, how ‘the doctrine of devils’ is, in all the cases considered, capable of being

<sup>h</sup> Contr. Duas Epp. Pel. ii. §. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Garn. ad Merc. ii. p. 316. Juvat observare neminem Nestorianum, si coherenter sentire velit, peccatum originale veramque Christi Redemptoris gratiam atque hominis ad opera pietatis impotentiam posse defendere: neminem Pelagianum, sin minus pugnantia loqui

amet, posse veram Christi divinitatem tueri unionisque hypostaticæ ad redemptionis finem necessitatem.’ And p. 328. ‘Nestorius in nulla parte operum mentionem interioris gratiæ fecit,’ &c.

<sup>k</sup> See the passages of Theodorus given in part i. chap. iii. §. 7.

brought round to this point—to the assertion of two opposite principles, that canker<sup>1</sup> which saps all orthodoxy.

25. Thus much then will suffice to shew, that there is some truth in the *first point* we were desirous to prove, viz. that all heresies tend towards the Manichean or or Pantheistic tenet of a dualism, tend, that is, to the assertion that there are two first causes, a good and evil. The heresies already treated of lie so much at the bottom of other later heresies, that it is credible that what can be shewn of them could be shewn of others. Thus the Lutheran theory of consubstantiation contains a Eutychian element; the doctrines of Wickliff and the Waldenses abounded in Manichean principles; and the Calvinistic view of double predestination drives naturally towards a dualism; and Jansenism eventually leads to Calvinism, and through it to the same conclusion<sup>m</sup>. Taking it for granted then, that all heresies contain Pantheistic elements, let us first use Manicheism, as if a full development of all heresies, and see, whether its tenets in particular are not most especially gainsaid by the privilege we claim for Mary. They held the flesh of Christ to be phantastic and unreal, in common with the Apollinarians and Eutychians<sup>n</sup>. If this be true, the Maternity of Mary is at once cut away, for all she

<sup>1</sup> Bas. Hex. ii. 4. 'Η βδελυκτὴ Μανιχαίων αἵρεσις ἦν σηπεδόνα τις τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν προσειπὼν οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτάνοι τοῦ προσήκοντος.

<sup>m</sup> V. Tourneley de Gratia, p. 553. ed. Migne, and comp. n. d. p. 264. whence it appears that Baius hated the Immunity. It is worth remarking, that Apollinaris took the words, οὐδὲ θέλει ζωοποιεῖ ὁ Υἱός, to imply that there were some damned,

because God did not choose to save them. See Nyssen's remarks on this adv. Apoll. cap. 29.

<sup>n</sup> Aug. Serm. 37. §. 17. Photiniani nihil divinum in Domino confitentur: Manichæi quasi totum divinum et tamen tam falsum ut nec saltem humanum. Si enim homo non erat, ergo mortuus non est, ergo crucifixus non est, ergo non resurrexit.



gave Christ according to us was his flesh, and this Maternity is conceived by us as the leading idea, so to speak, in God's mind, owing to which he gave her all her other privileges. The miraculous birth of Christ, by which he secured the integrity of his Mother's body, would cease with them to have any existence. We see then they would revolt from any privileges ascribed to her, based upon this Maternity. Hence Cyril has justly observed, that "if God had created his flesh from the earth like Adam's, it would have given a handle to those who wished to misrepresent the Incarnation, and above all to the impious Manichees<sup>o</sup>," who, so far as they denied the reality of Mary's Maternity, were making common cause with Nestorius<sup>p</sup>. They denied the resurrection of the body. This would make them averse to the privilege of the Assumption, which can, as we have seen, be most easily explained on the supposition, that being born without sin, death had no dominion over her. This reassumption of a flesh henceforth eternal, which is physically impossible if flesh does not rise again, may, for aught we see, be morally impossible for sinful flesh before the restitution of all things.

26. They held also the existence of a dualism, i. e. of two original and conflicting principles. Now they could, even on this theory, have afforded to allow Christ an immunity from sin, because the origin of his birth was not carnal but spiritual, even if they had not made this unnecessary by giving him only the semblance of a body. But as they argued in

<sup>o</sup> c. Nest. p. 8. b.

<sup>p</sup> St. John Chrysostom, quoted in VI t̃a. act. 8, p. 1189. c. says, οὐκ ἀπλῶς εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἔρχεται ἀπηρτισμένον καὶ πεπληρωμένον, ἀλλ' εἰς μητράν παρθενικὴν, ἵνα μὴ

νομισθῇ φαντασία τὸ γινόμενον. So Aug. c. Faust. Max. xx. §. 11. Potestne terra de Sp. Sancto concipere patibilem Jesum, et Maria Virgo non potuit?



defence of an evil principle, from the fact that the evil, lust, is necessary to bring us into this world, and thought this principle required matter, and was a function of matter, they could not by any possibility relish the doctrine of Mary's Immunity. She was conceived, so far as her existence was due to her parents, as other children are: she grew up from the same matter as that out of which all men are formed: only God, by a special miracle, prevented its being to her the vehicle of original sin. Whatever theory be the right one, as to the immediate channel by which original sin is conveyed to each man at his conception, certainly the Manicheans must have held, that it was through matter, which they thought so intimately bound up with sin, that God could not take it into himself. For if our belief be true, evil is not a substance, but a quality, and therefore God could remove it from his Mother: the devil, who took it into his substance by an act of his will, could not give it a substance in others also<sup>1</sup>. If therefore Manes were called up from his place, and asked what prospect he thought he would have of giving his doctrine a permanent hold upon maintainers of the Immaculate Conception, malice fresh from hell would not have the audacity to assert, that it was no hindrance to the promulgation of this nucleus of all heresies. All that line of heresies, whose 'dark foundations rest' upon his own, would feel him to be a bringer of unwelcome news, when he told them of the prevalence of a belief, so fatal to that error which it had been the policy of their infernal master to endeavour through him and through them to propagate upon the earth.

<sup>1</sup> Persuasit malum diabolus tanquam naturam. A. de Nupt. et C. ii. 57.

## CHAP. VI.

ON THE OPPOSITION OF PARTICULAR HERESIES TO THE IMMACULATE  
CONCEPTION.

1. THE observations made in the fourth chapter entitle us to assume in this, that Julian made a shew of zeal for the Immaculate Conception. Let us now proceed to consider, how far this zeal was likely to be sincere and lasting, by considering the bearing of that belief on other Pelagian doctrines. Now it has been already admitted, that Pelagians would gladly have used the Immunity of Mary as an item in an induction to prove, that there was no law of sin: but they would not have felt drawn to this Immunity, when it was insisted upon, as Catholics insist upon it, as the sole and only instance in which that law was abrogated, as in fact an exception which, by making Mary “our nature’s *solitary* boast,” proves most forcibly what the rule is. The Immunity of Mary exempts her entirely from the original taint: the Pelagians contended, that there was no such taint. By being exempted from this taint, she was (it is generally believed) exempted from concupiscence also: the Pelagians, so far from allowing that concupiscence was an evil, planted it in the flesh of Christ himself. Her Immunity would naturally exempt her from the pains of childbirth: the Pelagians gave these pains a place in Paradise. It naturally\*

\* See above, p. 293.

prevented death from having a lasting hold upon her: but they say death did not come into the world by sin. It implies, that sinlessness could not be obtained without a singular grace cutting off the entail of sin in the very moment of Mary's conception: Pelagians contended, that men were able of themselves, if they chose, to be perfect. Pelagians would assert, that there were men on earth who needed not to say daily 'forgive us our trespasses' for themselves, but only for others: the maintainers of the Immunity would make Mary's exemption from such need, a result of her sole and singular privilege. In fact, it may be doubtful whether a Pelagian, who had been hardened for centuries in hell in the love of his own heresy, would not be as much tormented by the Church singing of the Immaculate Conception, as by the yells of the damned. It would torment them at every turn of their heresy, when they reflected on it. It would be as odious to Pelagians, because it ascribes Mary's glory to divine predestination, as it would to Manichees, because it endows her with a freedom of will to choose, whether she should accept Gabriel's tender for our salvation or not. And therefore it would be odious to them both, just on the two opposite points in which we have set it forth as agreeing with Catholic teaching. But all the other points in which its odiousness to Pelagians has been instanced, are points from which they might easily glide off into Manicheism.

2. Julian's patron and friend, Nestorius, shall next be cited from the realms of darkness. Two opposite heresies, Manicheism and Pelagianism, have been already put before the reader: of the next pair of opposite heresies, Nestorianism and Eutychianism,

Nestorianism is openly allied to Pelagianism, and indirectly and covertly to Manicheism: Eutychianism is obviously and naturally allied to Manicheism, and only connected loosely with Nestorianism. It will be well then to see in what particular respects Nestorius would be likely to gainsay the Immunity of Mary, before we come to the Eutychians, the natural allies of Manicheism. Now Nestorius, who affected to venerate Christ as the Redeemer of the world, and carried his veneration so far as virtually to make his flesh a fourth hypostasis<sup>b</sup>, capable of adoration, yet jeered at Catholics for making Christ a God of two and three months' old in the womb. He reconciled these two inconsistent positions to himself, by supposing the flesh to become by degrees adorable, to grow into a God, as it were, from having been a creature. He expressed a fear, that the use of the word Theotocos, or Mother of God<sup>c</sup>, might lead men to think Mary a goddess, a most reasonable fear for a heretic, who made the nature, or rather the person, she gave him become adorable, to entertain. He affected to fear lest Catholics, by introducing such a title, should introduce a mixture or confusion of natures, although he knew that nobody held any such view<sup>d</sup>: he might with good reason have feared, lest men should draw such a conclusion from his own premisses. It would be reasonable with the Nestorian premiss, 'The flesh of Christ deserves a separate adoration,' and the admitted premiss, 'Mary gave him that flesh,' to conclude, either that the flesh of Mary deserves adoration; or to escape this by saying, that it became after she had given it

<sup>b</sup> See vol. i. p. 194. f.

p. 590. fin.

<sup>c</sup> Nest. ap. Cyril, p. 29. c.<sup>d</sup> Cyril, ib. p. 33. b. Compare Theodor. in Leont. ap. Canis. above ch. v. §. 20.



confused with the Divine Nature, which seems to have been the earliest phase of Eutychianism. He could not enter into the Catholic idea of the Sacred Maternity, or conceive that mysterious union of the two natures in Christ, without supposing it to imply, that at that rate Mary gave him his Divine Nature. Hence he talked of Christ as if, in the Catholic sense, a God of two or three months' old : and his followers, pressed perhaps with the arguments which Cyril and others drew from John the Baptist, were careful to make their Christ filled with all graces in the womb. It is clear they must have done so, or else have made his words, "there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist," include himself. It is then perfectly clear, that they would abominate the doctrine of the Immunity, because the Saviour of their devising would by that doctrine be deprived of the sole preeminence which they had left him<sup>1</sup>. The Nestorian Christ might have rejoiced in God his Saviour, as much as the Catholic Mary. The flesh of the Catholic Mary would make as vivific<sup>2</sup> matter for communion, as that of the Nestorian Christ. It has been magnificently said of the Arian controversy, that by obliging the Fathers to shew how much a created nature could have without ceasing to be a creature, it left a throne vacant for Mary : of the Nestorian controversy it might be said, that

\* Theodor. ap. Leont. in Canis A. L. i. p. 585. p. 586. 589. gives Christ the power of *discerning* good and evil, and of progressing in virtue, at an earlier period than others have it, as a consequence of his immaculate and marvellous conception. Vigil. Const. p. 14. e.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. in Const. Vigil.

p. 16. d. Spiritu indigebat ut immaculatus appareret. p. 28. d. p. 198. xii. p. 242. a.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. i. p. 102. y. No opportunity should be let slip of also pointing out any approach to that mischievous and pantheistic confusion of distinct persons animadverted upon in vol. i. p. 390. n. t.



by shewing how much human nature in particular could have without becoming God, it left a throne vacant for the Mother of God. The well-known words of Albertus Magnus express admirably the dignity of Mary: "More united to God she could not be, without becoming God." Their weight here will be more felt, if we invert them: Less united to God she would have been, if she had not had her entire existence to spend in growing in grace.

3. The opposite heresy of Eutyches is not less likely to have eschewed the doctrine of the Immunity than that of Nestorius. It will be remembered, that when it first broke out, Leo the Great supposed it to be a revival of Nestorianism. The offshoots of it in part would seem to confirm this impression: for they in some instances spoke of the two natures of Christ as becoming gradually one nature, and so might seem to countenance Nestorius, who made the two natures obtain their full conjointness by degrees. The apparent similarity, however, to Nestorianism, which Eutychianism wore at starting, soon vanished upon closer inspection, and it proved to be a revival of one of the forms of a heresy particularly obnoxious to Nestorius. "While the Essence of the unchangeable Word," says Leo, "remained, that Essence which he has as much as the Father and the Holy Ghost, without time and eternally, the Word became flesh within the Virgin's womb, in such way, that through the ineffable mystery, by one conception and by one birth, according to the reality of the two Substances, the same Virgin was both Handmaid and Mother of the Lord. This (as Luke the Evangelist declares) Elizabeth understood, and so said, 'Whence is this

to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" Let Eutyches also be stricken with the same anathema as Nestorius; for he, having wallowed in the error of the ancient heresies, picked out the third dogma of Apollinaris, [which asserted, that Christ had a flesh not taken from the woman, but made from the Word, converted and changed into flesh<sup>h</sup>.] Hence having denied the reality of his human flesh and soul, he asserted, that the whole of our Lord Jesus Christ is of one nature, as if the Deity of the Word itself had converted itself into flesh and soul. So to be conceived and to be born, to be nourished and to grow, to be crucified and to die, to be buried and to rise again, to ascend into heaven also, and to sit on the Father's right hand, . . . would belong to that Essence only, which, without a real flesh, does not admit of any of these things in itself. For the Nature of the Only-begotten is the Nature of the Father, is the Nature of the Spirit, and is at the same time impassible, and at the same time unchangeable, being the eternal Trinity's undivided unity and consubstantial equality. Hence, if the Eutychian holds aloof from the perversity of Apollinaris, in order that he may not be convicted of thinking the Deity passible and mortal, yet still dares to assert, that the incarnate Word, that is, the Word and flesh, has but one nature; undoubtedly he passes into the madness of Manicheus and Marcion, and believes that the Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus, did every thing in pretence only, and that it was not a human body in him, but a phantastic semblance of a body which appeared to the eyes of the beholders<sup>i</sup>."

<sup>h</sup> Aug. de Dono P. §. 67.  
Ball. ad Leo, p. 1179. n. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Leo Epist. clxv. §. 2. or  
cxxiv. §. 2.

4. Such was the heresy of Eutyches, in the eyes of the great Latin Doctor of the Incarnation. If one of his successors<sup>k</sup> could say of a later Eutychian, that he made the Virgin of no use, it will not be too much to say of Eutyches himself, as here represented to us, that he ruined from head to foot the whole prototype after which Mary was formed. Her conception, birth, death, resurrection, and assumption, were what the Church claims them to be, because the love and tenderness of God in redeeming, chose not to be outdone by his love and tenderness in creating, and it had seemed fit in the predestinating council of the Eternal Trinity, that the second Adam should not be without a help mate for him, and that the Virgin Mary should restore the balance which the disobedience of the Virgin Eve had disturbed. But the Eutychian heresy, could it have been present at that council, would have wrested from the Prototype, Christ, the reality of that conception, birth, death, resurrection, and assumption, after which alone the weaker vessel could have had them as flesh of his flesh in the divine foresight. And if there was no need of the wonderful integrity of Mary's all-pure body to him, who reduced the flesh which came forth from it to an unreality, so neither would there be any need of the immaculate purity of a soul upon whose consent our redemption was made to depend, and whose authority was to be exerted over the human will of God made flesh. The accursed spirit then, if summoned from its place, would ill relish a doctrine which implies so intense a

<sup>k</sup> Felix iii. ap. Hard. Conc. Monoph. l. c. §. 23. §. 55.  
ii. p. 827. d. comp. Leont. c.

reality in Christ's assumed nature, that it had been to the Holy Trinity, as it were, the seal with which his predestinating hand had imprinted no less clear an impression of all its details upon Mary than he was able to form in a creature, whom he had himself purposely brought into being, with a capacity for receiving it. The whole tribe of Eutychians, doing the lusts of their father, were unwilling, says St. Anastasius<sup>1</sup>, to give Christ in reality that which they had associated with all impurity in themselves, and would, on this score too, have little relished the miracle, which as God has granted it in Mary's case alone, so it evinced the fulness of his hatred of those passions which ordinarily propagate sin. The whole tribe of them certainly, if dismissed from the chains of darkness to tempt men to their heresy again, would hate intensely a doctrine which, until it was fully effaced from men's minds, would never allow them to believe the unreality of that, for which God had made so entirely singular a preparation.

5. To examine all the offshoots of Eutychianism would be wearisome and unprofitable; nevertheless, the bearing of two of them in particular upon the Immaculate Conception is sufficiently remarkable to justify giving them a place here. The Monophysites, as has been stated above, allowed that Christ had two natures, yet united into one, much as the soul and body of man are two natures, but make up one human nature; so they thought divine and human nature were not one Person, but one compound nature in Christ. If so, it might be asked, with

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Gretser, xvi. p. 128—9. sub Menna *ibid.* p. 1220. e. Cf. Pet. Fullo. ap. Hard. ii. p. 1290. b. Maxim. ii. p. 262. 1369—70. p. 1390. c. Oriental.



whom is this nature, so compounded, consubstantial<sup>m</sup> ? you say it is one nature, therefore it is consubstantial with God, if Christ is God : you say also that he is man, and things which are consubstantial with the same, are consubstantial with one another ; and therefore Mary is either consubstantial with God, or not really God's Mother. Hence they also would object to a doctrine, which brings forcibly upon us what may be called God's careful preparation of Mary for the office he had designed her to fill. For if the two natures became one nature, we may well ask, when did they become so ? At the conception ? for if so, what was the use of Mary's singular grace, so far as it fitted her for governing Christ ? If she governed this one nature, how could she do it unless it was consubstantial to herself, or else inferior ? Man may govern a man, or a brute, but we cannot understand his governing an angel, unless an angel could take the nature of a man, or of a brute, into his own subsistency, and make hypostatically one with himself a nature capable of being governed. It is quite miraculous enough to suppose Mary rendered by a singular privilege capable, through the intervention of a common nature, of ruling a Person who is divine : but the Monophysite theory if it makes Christ consubstantial through his one nature with Mary, destroys the miracle ; if consubstantial with God, makes it blasphemous. For if he is some third nature, neither consubstantial with God nor Mary, neither with Creator nor creature, then he is not God ; and then indeed it is conceivable, that by

<sup>m</sup> Leont. ap. Mai. vii. p. 113. c. Jacob. §. 28. §. 84. de Nat. §. 12. §. 34. §. 36. Joh. Dam. comp. §. 2. de Duab. Vol. §. 8. 4.

some divine gift a superior nature might, in some single and exceptional case, be under the authority of an inferior, as the angels are, who acknowledge the man Christ Jesus as their king, or Mary as their queen. But at this rate, Christ, not being God, would be the Arian Christ, capable of receiving from God attributes not at all belonging to his nature, and able to be a little lower or a little higher than the Angels, or Mary, or Joseph; not according as his own divine good pleasure led him, but according as his Master and Creator chose. It is true that other theories than that of the Immaculate Conception might explain the authority Mary had over Jesus: but what is urged here is, that a Monophysite could not but hate any theory whatever, which does explain how she came to be fit for exercising such authority over a divine Person: for it assumes that Christ had both a nature capable of obeying, and also kept it for thirty years: and that one reason why Mary was immaculate was, that that nature, which never was subject to sin, might not so long obey a nature which had been subject at one time to sin. But if the Monophysite makes that nature become one nature with the divine at some later period, then he is openly turning towards Nestorianism; and whatever has been said to shew that Nestorius would hate the Immunity, will shew that the Monophysite also would hate it.

6. What has here been said of the Monophysite, will, in the eyes of a divine, anticipate any thing that can be said of the Monothelite. For as soon as ever controversies about the Trinity were in vogue, the Catholic doctors laid down the principle, that a separate will implies a separate nature. Two

separate natures may indeed will the same thing, but not with the same will. Thus the Trinity, which is one single nature, has but one will; and though angels will the same thing as the Trinity does, when they know it, they do not will it with the same will. For the will of the Trinity was in existence before they existed, and gave them their being, and in it a will able to follow his own will, or to rebel against it, which latter course several of them chose. But the will of the Trinity not only never does change, but never could change, as that of the rebel angels could. A separate nature then has a separate will<sup>n</sup>, and Christ having two natures would have had two separate wills, capable of determining themselves to two separate things, had not those two natures been so fully and perfectly united, that it was *morally* impossible they should ever determine themselves to two separate objects. Still, being two natures, they always had two wills, a divine will and a human will: that these two wills always willed one object, will not prevent their being two distinct wills, any more than the fact that the angels and God at any given moment may will the same thing. But the will of Christ not only did not, but could not, become rebellious, as that of devils did: nor could it, like the prince of Persia's will, will that, which it turned out afterwards, was not God's will. For it did always the things that pleased the Father's will, that is, the one will of that one Nature, the Most holy Trinity. Nevertheless, having a human will as well as a divine, with the human

<sup>n</sup> The Monothelites affected p. 1314. c. but of course held to hate the Monophysites, and substantially the same heresy. anathematized their doctors. See cap. v. §. 19. 20. See Hard. Conc. iii. p. 1174. c.

will he could be a little lower than the Angels, or Mary, or Joseph, as St. Cyril and St. Austin teach°. The Immaculate Conception then fitted that will which was so long to rule the human will of Christ, for this office, and the Monothelites would feel the same objection as the Monophysites to making Almighty God the author of a miracle either useless, if Christ had but one will and that a human one; or blasphemous, if the one will which they allowed him, was divine. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception justifies Christ for subjugating his human will to his Mother, as much as any thing can justify him. He who is not fit to obey, is not fit to command: Christ therefore gave his Mother ‘a capacity for receiving a command<sup>p</sup>,’ (as St. Austin has it,) as soon as she was created, that by the devotion of her entire being from its very commencement to obedience to the divine will, she might have an aptness for commanding his human will when he became incarnate. But the Monothelite, who asserts that there was but one will in Christ, would not want the Immaculate Conception to explain the power of the Mother of God, nor would he now relish a doctrine which, by only giving occasion to blaspheme, (if he put the *divine* will under Mary’s,) would but have increased those torments, with which his father has rewarded him for his lie.

7. Hitherto we have only considered how far those heretics, who openly propound a theory of the

° Vide supr. vol. i. p. 204. n. q. Though what they say is of his human nature, we are absolutely sure they would have said the same of his human will. Damasc. de duab. Vol. 28. §. 2. and Max. ii. p. 67. use in a similar way a passage

of the Divine in which he spoke of the soul of Christ, as if he had spoken of his will. Comp. Anast. Presb. ap. Mai. c. N. vii. p. 196. *Λοιπὸν ὅτε κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>p</sup> See part i. ch. ii. §. 5. part ii. ch. i. §. 5.



Incarnation, would, if summoned from the realms of darkness, relish the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. But, as it has been said above, that a theory of the Trinity would necessarily lead to one upon the Incarnation; let us consider next, how the two main heresies upon the subject of the Trinity would feel in the presence of this august privilege of Mary. The heresy of Apollinaris<sup>1</sup> may indeed be regarded, (though it was not intended to be so,) as, in its origin, an attempt to give consistency and orthodoxy to what all along was felt to be the Arian doctrine of the Incarnation, viz. that the Word stood in the place of the human soul in Christ<sup>2</sup>. Yet Apollinaris so soon shifted off from denying the reality of Christ's soul to denying that of his body<sup>3</sup>, that he shall not be summoned here to give his opinion upon the Immaculate Conception. Suffice it to say, that Nyssen<sup>4</sup> urges, that if, according to Apollinaris, Christ had a pre-existing flesh, then Mary also had a pre-existing flesh: which seems to shew, that this great Father saw that the privileges which could really be ascribed to Christ's flesh, would be an index of those which belonged to Mary's. But this intermediate stage of his doctrine, where he had halted before the denial of a real flesh, i. e. the assertion of a pre-existing flesh, connects it well with Arianism, which had halted, as it were, at the assertion of a

<sup>1</sup> Merend. ad Damasum. p. 204. n. b. Offerebant plurimum Apollinaristæ de recta Trinitatis fide, quanquam Arianos, ut eis recte exprobrat Nyssen. in Antirrh. etiam in hac parte impietate superarent.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. ad Success. p. 149. Eud. ap. Mai. c. N. vii. p. 17. Hypat. ap. Hard. ii. p. 1162 d.

and iii. p. 892. Leont. de S. iii. p. 505. p. 506. b. Ruffin. ap. Merc. i. p. 303. and ii. p. 29. Petav. de Inc. i. cap. v. §. 4. Præf. Bened. ad Hil. p. xxxvi. no. 120. Sirmond. ad Fac. Herm. ix. 3. Maxim. ii. p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. c. Apoll. i. 12. above, p. 320. n. b. Nyssen. c. Apoll. §. xxxiii. t. ibid. §. xiii.

pre-existing soul, or spirit which supplied the soul's place. But we must not expect from open and professed Arians, a clear statement of the attributes of this incarnate spirit, whose inconstituentality with God the Father they were principally concerned in proving, although they not unfrequently called it God, very God, and the like. However, it so happens, that one who was an Arian heart and soul in all his real tendencies, has left us the following genuine expressions of their theory upon this head. If the Church could summon Eusebius before her, to ask his opinion of the Immunity, she might address him as follows: "You said, I believe, in your lifetime that 'one star differs from another star in glory, and that it was somewhat in this way that we were also to understand the order amongst the incorporeal and spiritual beings, seeing the unspeakable great power of the God of all comprises all things at once, and the creative and illuminative power of the divine Word comes second after the Father, (whence also the Hebrews love to call him, The true Light, and the Sun of Justice,) and that the Holy Spirit stands third after the second, being in the place of the moon".

\* Præp. Ev. p. 325. Compare also p. 316. p. 320. p. 532. p. 541. German. Const. ap. Mai. Spic. vii. p. 14. [*ὁ πολυμαθὴς ἡ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἰπεῖν Εὐσέβιος . . . . κυρῶν τῆς τε ἄλλης τῆς τε Ἀρειανικῆς καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς εἰκαιμυθίας τὸ ἔκλυτον, ὡς ἐν πλάσματι ἀπολογίας ταῦτα συνιστῶν.* See also p. 22. where the Saint assures us, that in their library at Constantinople, his works were not put with the orthodox fathers, but in a box by themselves.] Newman, on Athan. p. 62. p. 107. p. 292. Petav. de Incarn. xi. 4, 7. de

Deo, iii. 8, 2. de Trin. i. pec. cap. 11. 12. ii. 4. §. 9. vi. 6. §. 3. Noris, Hist. Syn. Quint. p. 815. Boucat de persona Filii, p. 91-3. Maranus de Divin. Christi, p. 579. Viger. ad P. E. l. c. This opinion of Eusebius's heterodoxy may be almost called the received one amongst Catholics now-a-days. The reader who wants to see him defended, may consult Berti, vol. ii. p. 124. Vales. Præf. Hist. Eccles. Lee prelim. diss. i. to the new discovered work of this writer: only let him re-

You are also reported to have said, that this moon did not know of the mystery of Christ's Nativity<sup>v</sup>, and certainly this report is consistent with the above statement. But at all events, you said when God the Son was lying hidden in the womb, he remained unclouded and unperturbed, though in such close communion with flesh: and when born, and thought to be like other infants, he enjoyed the use of reason<sup>x</sup>.' Now as you doubtless put on, accursed spirit, this semblance of orthodoxy, because, with others of your school, you held your secondary God to serve for soul in the man Christ Jesus, to have had a pre-existence, and so to have had consciousness even in the womb<sup>y</sup>: I adjure you then in the name of the living God, to answer me without prevarication this question: 'Shall we not be dashing and confounding' (in the words of your brother Arian) 'your simulated distinctions, shall we not be wresting out of your hands one of the chief marks of the distinction you confer on your pre-existing unsubstantial Son, if we define boldly that his Mother, though no goddess, yet had thus much, that the moon of our system shone as brightly

member that theology is a science, and that those who have not been trained to it, may think statements orthodox, which are not so. St. Cyril well observes of heretics of this sort, *Πρόσεστι τὸ πάνουργον αὐτοῖς καὶ κακότηες εἰς λόγους. Θεὸν μὲν ἐροῦσιν ἀληθῶς τὸν Υἱὸν, μὴ μὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι κατὰ Φύσιν.* in Jo. p. 791. E.

<sup>v</sup> Append. ad August. iii. p. 118.

<sup>x</sup> Demonst. Ev. p. 500. b.

<sup>y</sup> Possibly the passage Maximus (vol. ii. p. 171. and comp. Jo. Damasc. vol. i. p. 550.) quotes

from Basil in Ps. 44. really came from Eusebius or some kindred writer, and has the same heterodox intention as the passage in the text. V. Maran. Præf. ad Basil. p. li. §. x. who shews that the spurious Basil on Isaiah, from whom this is really taken by S. Max. followed Eusebius. This is the reason of the words 'may possibly' in n. d. p. 267. vol. i. Damascene, however, l. c. ascribes similar doctrine to Basil. Eusebius, if like other Origenists, 'would have held a pre-existence.

as the sun of yours, and filled, as a creature made in the end of time, as high a place as you assign to him, whom you lyingly denominate a creative spirit? No doubt you make this spirit wise enough before it was made flesh: but I am asking you, how you will like the distinctive marks you give it in the womb<sup>2</sup>, to wit, to be unclouded and unperturbed, to be transferred to a mere creature, who, by virtue of the privilege I claim for her, enjoyed all which you make the distinctive mark of your embodied Logos from the first instant of her existence? If Eusebius be now one of those accursed spirits, what could we expect to be his answer to such an appeal, but a yell of infernal despair?

8. Let us see next how the heretics of the opposite school, viz. the Sabellians, would have relished this privilege claimed for the blessed Virgin. Now it has been shewn above, how this heresy would tend naturally towards a Manichean theory of the Incarnation. But it may be observed further in this place, that the Semi-Arian creed, given us in Hilary<sup>a</sup>, speaks of Sabellians as dividing the union and that Arius himself, in an epistle preserved by Epiphanius, asserts the same of Sabellius; though an Ultra-Arian writer quoted by St. Cyril seems to attribute an opposite error to Sabellius<sup>b</sup>. For by the union is possibly

<sup>2</sup> Austin, c. Max. Arian. ii. v. 'Sufficit mihi quod ita putasti *Christum* ad terrena descendisse contagia, ut tamen confitereris nullum habuisse peccatum.' The Arian disputant then gave Christ no more, than what we give Mary.

<sup>a</sup> Hil. Trinitate, iv. 12. vi. 5 ed. Bened. Epiphanius, p. 732. e. I cannot feel sure that *την μο-*

*νάδα* can mean 'the one Person Christ,' as Coustant. (in Hil. iv. 12. n. i.) makes 'unionem' mean.

<sup>b</sup> In Joan. p. 846. d. I see no sense in the Greek or Latin either here; should it be, *τῶν ἕνα ἀμφοτέρους εἶναι νομιζόντων τὸ ψεῦδος* (for *ἐν ἀμφοτέροις*)? i. e. the false doctrine of those who think both Persons one.



meant the union of two Natures in Christ, and the dissolving of this would be implied in the assertion of one Person in the Trinity. If the Arian notion were true, the Word and flesh became one without a soul: if the Sabellian were true, Christ must have been either merely influenced by an energy of the one-person God, or else have had the Father for his soul. If the latter were his view, of course there would be the greatest difficulty upon the part of Sabellius to admit the truth of that doctrine of the Maternity which so forcibly implies a distinction of persons in the Trinity<sup>c</sup>. If, however, Christ was with him, a mere man having a certain divine energy at work in him, like a ray from the sun, capable of being drawn back again<sup>d</sup>, then he would like to give his Christ the same kind of preeminence which Eusebius bountifully bestowed upon him. If he had been asked when this energy put itself first forth in Christ, and assigned his childhood as the period, John the Baptist might rise from the dead, and reproach him for not conceding to Christ a greater honour than he had who was the servant. He must then have been driven to give the energy its beginning at the very first, and consequently would not have conceded to Mary a privilege which would have made a lily in Christ's court as great, as Sabellius could make the antitype of Solomon himself. But, perhaps, we know so little of the Sabellian theory of the Incarnation, except as exhibited in some of its later disciples, that it is not wise to add more here. For the general tendency<sup>e</sup> of the theories

<sup>c</sup> Vide Anselm. *cur Deus* *guage of Nazianzen given above,*  
*Homo.* ii. cap. 9. p. 328.

<sup>d</sup> Petav. *de Inc.* i. 3. 7. *Epiph.* <sup>e</sup> Chap. vi. 7.  
 62. init. and observe the lan-

of these last having been already pointed out, materials have been also already furnished in considering other heresies for finding their bearing in regard to the Immunity. Enough has been said to make it credible, that if any of those now reserved in darkness for the judgment, on account of any heresy in the Incarnation, were asked his opinion, he would be found a most decided opponent of the privilege the Church 'delighteth to honour.'

9. It has been observed by a judicious commentator upon Homer<sup>f</sup>, that it is not the great bard himself, but others who have represented Helen as else than modest. If this were so, it was not amiss that so many heroes, with so many ships and so many men, should so long labour in defence of injured purity. The length of the defence has increased Helen's celebrity; though one of their greatest champions for a long while held aloof from the war in her behalf, it was not from any doubts against her, but from want of encouragement to himself to proceed. But one Grecian nation is said to have furnished neither heroes, nor men, nor ships, for the battle. Of them Simonides is reported to have observed with severity :

' Troy with Corinthians hath no fault to find.'

This principle it has been my endeavour to apply in the present chapter. The heroes in theology have done well to fight with all their forces in behalf of the Immaculate Virgin, and the enemy of purity doubtless will feel his anger stirred against those who shew, that she whom he would fain have men believe was his prey, is guiltless of the charge. But heretical doctors will not earn the blame of their infernal master for defending this privilege, because

<sup>f</sup> Löwe ad Odyss. iv. p. 125.

in all *they* did do and teach, they furnished premises for its refutation. Hell with the heretics hath no fault to find. They have done nothing to make men believe that the Woman did really bruise his head<sup>g</sup>.

<sup>g</sup> The learned reader may be asked to consider, whether the confusion between good as a nature and as a quality, pointed out in p. 336. as the confusion made by Pelagians, is not substantially the same confusion, as that made by the Eutychians

between 'nature' and 'person.' For to merge the attributes which help to give a nature its individuality in the nature, is pretty nearly the same as to deny that a nature distinct can exist without a distinct personality.

## CHAP. VII.

THE CONTROVERSIES ON THE INCARNATION A KEY TO THE CHURCH'S  
MIND ON THE IMMUNITY.

1. IN the last chapter, we had occasion to consider the several heresies on the Incarnation, and to shew that their upholders could not well have taken our side upon the subject of the Immunity. Heresies no doubt were plied against the Church by Satan in such order, as he thought best suited to the furtherance of his kingdom upon earth. Valentinus, Manes, or Apollinaris, he raised up (so to speak) in early time, to furnish a kind of mock antiquity to the whole tribe of the Eutychians. Sabellius did nearly the same for the Unitarians, as did other early heresies for other later ones. But one most observable piece of policy is, that he raised up heresies in pairs, which seldom could be combated by one Doctor in his own lifetime. A great advantage to be gained by this was, that each succeeding heresy could always contrive to make the orthodox appear to hold the extreme, which was opposite to itself. The fact, that the Eutychian party tried to shelter themselves under the authority of St. Cyril, is a good instance to shew the advantage of such policy to Satan's kingdom. Nevertheless, if the order of heresies be capable of being regarded on one side as resulting from the policy of Satan, it may be also regarded on another as resulting from the restraining



hand of Almighty God. If God saw<sup>a</sup> that the principles developed in the Trinitarian controversy would be necessary for the refutation of Nestorianism, and those developed in controverting the latter for the refutation of Eutychianism, and those developed in refuting this for the controverting of Monothelitism; then we see, why he should allow Satan not the order he might like the best, but that best suited to manifest the glory of his Church. God gave prophecies of Mary from the very first; he shewed her glory more clearly in Jael; he spoke of it still more plainly in Isaias, in the Jewish Church; and in the Christian he 'poured forth doctrine *as* prophecy',<sup>b</sup> developing it in a similar order, allowing Satan perhaps to attack the Church just in that particular order which was best suited to display in organic growth, and in a written form, what he had printed on the mind of his Church from the first.

2. Yet it is possible, notwithstanding this, that Satan himself had an organized scheme of attack upon the Church; and if we possessed more of the writings of ancient heretics, we might find traces of this scheme in those whom he had inspired with the doctrine of devils. In the first Lateran Council, a fragment of a heretic of St. Athanasius' time is produced, which anticipates future heresies almost as strikingly as the Saint did the principles calculated to refute them. "Where is the need of a soul," says this heretic, "in order, that a perfect man may be worshipped along with God: wherefore John proclaims this truth, 'the Word was made flesh,' that is, was compounded with flesh, not with a soul,

<sup>a</sup> See part i. chap. i. §. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Eccclus. xxiv. 33 or 46.

<sup>c</sup> Hence St. Paul (Ephes. iv.

14.) speaks of *μεθοδεία τῆς πλάνης*.  
cf. vi. 11.

as the traffickers in the faith of our day assert, but it was with the body he was joined, and became one; for in what sense is Christ one, except he be one person<sup>d</sup>, and one compound nature, as we know is the case with a man's soul and body. But if he had a soul, as the bastard teachers of bastard doctrine teach the Churches now-a-days, then there must have been war between the motions of God and the soul, for each of these originates motions of its own, and leads to operations that are different<sup>e</sup>." Here we have the arguments not of Apollinaris only, but of the Monophysites and Monothelites; and a scope too furnished to Nestorians and Pelagians, who might bring in their theories to explain how this Arian's objections to the Incarnation were irrelevant. For the Pelagian would say, that the war actually existed in Christ; and the Nestorians would allow, that a man might be worshipped with God, though he had a soul: and so this heretic seems to bring before us what was in Satan's mind from the first<sup>f</sup>, namely, to evolve opposite heresies, by making statements sure to elicit opposition; and to furnish a show of antiquity for later heresies, by giving early anticipations of them. The enemy of mankind might have observed, how God had developed prophecy by degrees, how he had stated his intention to pour out doctrine in the same way, how he had actually begun to do so: hence he aimed at furnishing a counter system, as if he knew that men dreaded novelties as such, and not as *profane* novelties, as

<sup>d</sup> *πρόσωπον*, the Nestorian subterfuge. See Assem. B. O. iv. p. 219.

<sup>e</sup> Harduin. vol. iii. p. 892. b. The same quotation is given also in Anastasius's Catena on

the Incarnation, in Mai C. N. vii. p. 17, 18.

<sup>f</sup> This shews why our Lord (as noticed in vol. i. p. 242.) must, in order to teach properly, know Satan's wishes.

they were ordered to do. Hence Agatho, in his celebrated letter to the sixth General Council, has asserted, that the heretics 'all give Christ but one will and one operation,' an observation which even if abstractedly capable of being translated, so as not to include all heretics, is, in fact, true of all, Nestorians included. For even they, with a logic<sup>g</sup> as faulty as their theology, attribute but one operation to the two natures of their Christ, and thus join hands with the followers of Severus<sup>h</sup>.

3. Having then now given a compendious review of the heresies regarding the Incarnate Word, and suggested that Satan had a plan in the order in which he plied them, and a scope or aim in view, let us consider whether the successive victories earned by the Church, were not also victories in Mary's cause. Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the devil: let us consider whether in destroying the works of heretics, (whose foul and artful hearts were the caves from which Satan spoke his oracles,) God does not furnish us with proofs of a design to bring clearly to light that great and signal destruction of Satan's work, which had taken place in the second Eve, the true Mother of all living. That God was carrying on at the same time a counter system to that of Satan, in a regular and organic manner, has been assumed already: how this system, viewed as such, bore upon the display of Mary's Immunity to all the world, is what is here attempted to be shewn. There was a time when Christians only, and not even catechumens, knew what is present on our altars:

<sup>g</sup> Hard. vol. iii. p. 1094. b.

<sup>h</sup> See p. 334. n. s.

<sup>i</sup> So Cassian says of the Fathers before Nestorius: Hi

omnes quasi *prophético* olim spiritu ad confundendas blasphemias tuas cuncta dixerunt. De Incarn. vii. v. fin.

by degrees, heretics also knew what the Church believed thereon: now any rationalist philosopher can tell you what is believed by a Catholic when he talks of the Real Presence. Here an order is observed: God taught his Church from the first, what at the last all the world has come to know: God let the awful secret escape (so to speak) by degrees. First men dreamt a child was slaughtered in the rites of Christians: by degrees they knew something more was there, and of a more mysterious kind: now all men know that we believe that the Flesh and Blood and Soul of God the Son is present on our Altars. In a similar way, the body from whence he took that flesh was first thought to have been defiled by adultery: then to have fallen as low as to have other children after God: then she was proclaimed Mother of God: then other titles of honour came before the world: and now heretics and heathen can learn, that we claim for the soul and body of Mary absolute immunity from sin.

4. Now if we glance again at the Monothelite controversy, we shall see that it was this which brought most distinctly before the world, that there was no need for Christ to have any other similarity to us than in substance only: that he could be perfectly and entirely consubstantial with us even if he had taken flesh from a person in every sense untainted by sin. Sophronius, for instance, has the following passage, which will illustrate my meaning. "Out of the untainted and virginal blood<sup>k</sup> of the

<sup>k</sup> Proclus long before (after calling her the *only* bridge to God for men) spoke of the immaculate flesh of the Virgin as the material κρόκη, out of which God's unmeasurable

grace wove the garment of his body. See above, p. 260. Nys-sen too, c. Apoll. §. 6. says, ἐκ τῆς ἀμικαντοῦ Παρθένου ἢ τῆς σαρκὸς μοῖρα συνηρανίσθη.



all-holy and untainted Virgin Mary, the Word having taken flesh, and become man in very deed, and being conceived in the virginal womb, and having fulfilled the time of regular conception, being like unto us men in *all things natural, and not conveying sin*, and not disdaining our vileness with all its sufferings, is born God with a human body and form, likewise endued with a rational and incorporeal soul." Now it would be unfair to put too much on this passage : 'all-holy' is an epithet bestowed on some Saints : untainted may mean untainted by intercourse with a male, virginal blood may mean blood uncontaminated even by conjugal pleasure. Still it is impossible to help feeling, that such a passage, even if it were an isolated one, read, as it was, with approval before a General Council, pointing out as it does, that Christ took every thing human which did not convey sin, of a person extremely pure, leads one naturally to examine the amount of that purity and to think, that there is no need whatever for Mary's flesh to have sin in it : all that is necessary is, that the nature should be a human nature ; no corruption either of the blood or of the will, would be of any use towards securing this identity of nature. The expression too, the untainted blood, is a very remarkable one : Sophronius knew that God had made of one blood all the nations under heaven, and that that blood was tainted by Adam's fall. For this he plainly alludes to, when he says, that Christ took all except what conveyed sin. A little before he had said, 'the Virgin was free from *every* pollution in body, *and* soul, *and* mind;' and again, 'He wished to become man, that by like he might purify like, and by the kindred

<sup>1</sup> Hard. Conc. iii. p. 1267. d. heretics he denounces Pela-

<sup>m</sup> In p. 1290. among other gius.

might save the kindred, and by the cognate brighten the cognate: *for this reason*, a holy virgin is taken, and is sanctified body and soul, and so ministers to the incarnation of the Creator, as being pure, and holy, and undefiled.' Another acute writer upon the same subject, St. Maximus the Martyr, speaks likewise of Christ taking his flesh 'from the virginal untainted blood of the all-holy Mother of God. So he became like us perfect man, except sin only, through which we often are at variance with, and struggle against God in our will, inasmuch as *we have the impulse in either direction inherent in this will*. But himself being by nature free from all sin, as being not mere man, but God in a human nature, had no opposing (will), but kept our nature untainted, and entirely and absolutely unpolluted<sup>n</sup>.' Maximus here uses the same words of Christ and of Mary, and is plainly adopting the language of Sophronius, with whom he was personally acquainted. And again he says<sup>o</sup>, 'Honorius brings forward Holy Writ as mentioning the flesh, both with praise and blame, not as suggesting to us to conceive of the Lord's flesh as different from ours in nature and essence, (God forbid,) for he knew that this was taken from *our essence*, i. e. from the all-holy bowels of the ever-virgin Mother of God, who is of one nature with us, but as differing in its sinlessness, and in the fact of its having not the law of transgression in the members warring with the law of the Spirit. For there was not taken by the Saviour that flesh corrupted by sin, which wars with the law of his mind. For where the law of generation by sinful seed does not give the beginning, there neither is that law in the members, but the law of divine justice.' Here, although Christ's sanctity is attributed

<sup>n</sup> p. 29.<sup>o</sup> p. 131. cf. p. 75.

to his miraculous conception, it is plain, that all that can be said to exalt the state of the Holy Spirit's Bride, is said. He points distinctly out, that it is the essence or nature of man which was taken from Mary, not its corruptions. It is then the direct tendency of the Monothelite controversy, to bring clearly out that the sole and single thing requisite was, for Christ to come from a nature cognate with ours, and not from a sinful nature. Again, he speaks of heresy as "paring away from Christ the rational animate body which was taken of the untainted and holy all-glorious Virgin, who is truly Mother of God<sup>p</sup>." And St. John Damascene preserves similar expressions, when he speaks of the 'all-untainted and all-blameless womb of the holy Virgin<sup>q</sup>.' And his disciple Theodorus Abu-cára styles her 'all-pure and all-blameless,' and after speaking of Adam as polluted, speaks of 'the untainted blood of Mary<sup>r</sup>.'

5. Now supposing heresies to be overruled by God for certain ends, and supposing Mary's glory to be one of those ends, it is not a little remarkable, that the controversy which most plainly proved that Christ had a will capable of obeying Mary, also proved that there was no need for him to take that will in its corrupted and rebellious state, as we have it. What was necessary for him, or rather for us, was, that he should get our nature from one of that nature, and whatever shewed that he had no need of having it with its corruptions, went also towards shewing that the source from which he took it might also answer all purposes, to use a humble phrase, if exempt from those corruptions. Here then the Anti-Monothelite writers take up the note first struck

<sup>p</sup> p. 293.

<sup>q</sup> c. Nest. 43.

<sup>r</sup> ap. Gretser, xv. p. 360. d.

p. 380. b.

upon by the Anti-Pelagian writers. The former have to state most explicitly, that in ascribing to Jesus a human will, it is not meant to ascribe to him that will considered as in a state of rebellion, and as deviating from the original order of nature, but the will as it made up an essential part of man's original nature. Theodorus and the Pelagians, as we have seen, drove the Fathers into several contradictions of this war between the two natures, which these heretics blasphemously attributed to Christ, but it was the Monothelites who first compelled them to be so exceedingly explicit and distinct about the state of the human will in Christ, in order to shew, that when they gave Christ in the fullest and entirest sense the will essential to human nature, they did not give him the corruptions of that will, which are not essential to that nature, and no original part of it. Hence they make statements, all going to shew, that the nature as wanted for Christ's purposes, would most obviously be obtained from a body, from a womb, from blood, that had not the taint of Adam in it.

6. If God had any design in this, and really was building up, upon past victories over Pelagians, materials for Mary's honour, we might be expected to shew, that the eyes of the whole world should be turned to some one point, where the relation of the Pelagian heresy to the Monothelite came strongly out. Now the apparent fall of the Pope from his infallibility, is something calculated to draw the eyes both of hell and heaven, of heretic and Catholic, to one point. All critics now allow, that Honorius was actually anathematized for some thing by a General Council<sup>a</sup>; and that the letters of Pope Leo II., who

<sup>a</sup> Catalani in Conc. Gen. ii. p. 35. 'Emunctoris jam fere omnes naris homines fatentur vere fuisse in hac synodo proscriptum Honorium.'



speaks in the strongest terms of his miserable apathy, are genuine: and though all Catholic divines<sup>t</sup> deny that he erred in the faith, they can only prove it by the very thing here wanted, namely, by shewing the relation of Pelagianism to Monothelitism. That relationship lies in this: that the tendency of Monothelitism was to make the orthodox assert two wills in such way, as to appear to be asserting two opposite and conflicting wills in Christ: the tendency of Pelagianism, to make them appear to assert one natural will in Christ. The former heresy then would have this effect upon the manner of speaking, introduced by Anti-Pelagian writers: it would tend to make them state more explicitly, that any thing they said against the existence of two conflicting wills in Christ, was not meant to deny the existence of two wills opposed, so far as one was increate and the other created, though both wills agreed as to their object, though both had in view, so to speak, the same means for our salvation. We have then to shew distinctly, that the seeming fall of Honorius, at least, subserved the good purpose of drawing the eyes of the whole creation to the point where Pelagianism was brought in contact with Monothelitism.

7. But here we may be interrupted, and it may be said, Sophronius was as it were the master of

<sup>t</sup> Vide Palma Prol. H. E. tom. ii. pt. i. cap. xi. præ. p. 122. Ballerini de Prim. Rom. Pont. p. 421. Pagi Breviar. Gest. Rom. P. vol. i. p. 400-4. or in Baron. Ann. 633. xi. 119. Lupus in Concil. vol. iii. p. 20. If the severer critics upon Honorius' negligence be followed, no reasonable man should make a few defects in the proof of the infallibility a

ground for disbelieving the thing. The proof is moral, and admits of degrees. There would be no merit in believing the thing, if the proof was demonstrative. It is *à priori* likely, that in eighteen hundred years a few difficulties in the proof should occur. 'Did we but know the whole of the case,' as Butler says, the chances are such difficulties would vanish.

Maximus, Damascene followed Maximus implicitly, and Theodorus was a disciple of Damascene: it is true, that the synodical letter of Sophronius which you have quoted, was read and approved in the sixth General Council: but after all, these exaggerated expressions about the Virgin are more likely to have been palatable to Orientals, than to the soberer spirit which still lingered in the West. Let us see, then, whether any thing can be adduced to prove, that the same Monothelite controversy elicited expressions of a similar belief in regard to the Blessed Virgin's dignity in the West also. Now St. Martin the First was not merely Pope, but plainly a man of learning and acuteness. When he had finished the celebrated Lateran Council, he was accused by the court or heretical party, among other things, of saying something derogatory to the Blessed Virgin. His reply is certain to embody the general feeling of the West at the time, and it runs as follows: "Furthermore, touching our Lady, the glorious Ever-Virgin Mary, who bare our God and Lord Jesus Christ, whom all the holy and Catholic Fathers call the Mother of God, inasmuch as it was she who brought forth God made man, it is false what wicked men have testified against me, yea, rather against their own souls. For whosoever doth not honour and adore the Blessed Virgin above every creature and human nature, save him who was born of her, the venerable Ever-Virgin Mother of our Lord, (I mean,) let him be anathema in this world, and in the world to come." This is not indeed a document *ex cathedra*, and yet it plainly expresses the feeling of the West: no man of decent information would venture to use such strong language, much less so prudent a Pontiff, unless he

knew he was expressing the feeling of his brethren. The monk, who wrote the account of St. Martin's sufferings and death, tells us, that he was buried in a church of 'the most holy Mary, who is to be worshipped above all the saints, is most chaste, immaculate, very blessed, and most excellent of all creatures.' Here is an unlearned testimony to the effect, that Mary was looked upon as most excellent of all creatures; and the learned one of St. Martin, that she was above every human creature, except her Son. Perhaps it would be difficult to produce from a writer of an earlier period as strong an assertion of this exceeding preeminence. Yet, of course, it had been known all along, that none was greater than John the Baptist among those born of women, and therefore, as Mary is never put below him, it was known too<sup>u</sup> that she belonged in some special way to the kingdom of heaven\*. History does not tell us what St. Martin was charged with saying against her; it is pretty clear from his reply, that he must have been charged with not making her near enough to him who was born of her. He was driven, at all events, by the state of things generated by the Monothelite controversy, to avouch,

<sup>u</sup> Baronius, ad Ann. 650. gives it, *Beatam super omnem creaturam humanam*: Sirmondus and Harduin, vol. iii. p. 675. who takes it from him, *Super omnem creaturam atque naturam humanam*. Baronius's reading sounds the most natural: that of Sirmond seems to want *creaturam angelicam atque*. n. h. But they draw from different sources. Possibly *omnem* is a mistake for some abbreviation of *angelicam*. Either reading will

leave the residuum used in the text.

\* Jerome, cont. Pelag. i. §. 16. fin. argues, that Zacharias and Elisabeth were much inferior to Mary, who yet in her Magnificat ascribes all her grace to God: and adds, that John too himself was greater than his parents. And Theodoret, in Cant. iii. is said to make Mary greater than Cherubim, &c. The Liturgies of the whole world put her first. See part ii. chap. xii. §. 23.

that no human nature was so like Christ's as Mary's. And this is just the very same kind of assertion, as we find in Eastern writers of the same period: they apply pretty much the same epithets to the flesh of the one, as to that of the other. The point to prove will be, that they did so with a distinct understanding in their minds at the time, that the law of sin in the members, which makes our flesh tainted and polluted, came from a corruption in the will, superinduced by the fall\*. To this doctrine the conduct of Honorius drew attention. If this can be shewn, it will also have been shewn, that the epithets used of Mary's flesh had a meaning in them beyond what the mere letter of them conveys; or, in other words, that they were the natural produce of a controversy employed in considering the existence and state of the human will of our Lord, and that while they speak of Mary's flesh, must needs mean her soul likewise.

8. There is no difficulty in seeing, that if the law

\* Aut utrumque (corpus et anima) ex homine trahitur, aut alterum in altero tanquam in *vitiato vase* corrumpitur. A. c. Jul. Pel v. §. 17. Bell. de Am. Gr. iv. 12. So St. Anselm. de Concept. Virg. &c. cap. 10. 'Eadem ratione quâ monstratur rationalem naturam justam esse creatam, probatur etiam quod qui ex humana naturâ propagarentur non præcedente peccato, ex necessitate justitiam pariter haberent cum rationalitate. Siquidem qui creavit primum hominem sine parentum generatione, creat etiam eos, qui per *creatam ab illo* fiant propagandi naturam. Omnis igitur homo si peccatum non processit, simul esset, sicut Adam, et justus et rationalis. Quoniam vero Adam subjectus

esse noluit Dei voluntati, ipsa natura propagandi quanvis remaneret, non fuit subdita ejus voluntati, sicut esset si non peccasset, et gratiam quam de se *propagandis servare* poterat perdidit; atque omnes qui operante natura quam acceperat propagantur ejus adstricti debito nascuntur. And again, cap. 23. Quid convenientius ad ostendendam magnitudinem bonitatis Dei et [ad] plenitudinem gratiæ quam Adæ concedebat quam ut quorum *esse* in illius potestate sic erat, ut *quod* ille naturaliter erat hoc illi per illum essent, ita quod in ejus esset arbitrii libertate, ut qualis erat ipse justitia et felicitate, tales eos propagaret.



of sin extended to our flesh only, and not to our will, we could abrogate it for ourselves by an act of the will. When God had made man, that he might occupy a kind of middle place between angels and brutes, in order to preserve that ordinate gradation of all things which pervades the universe, no doubt the same divine grace which enlightened Adam's soul to worship God, also instructed him in the position he held in the universe. He may have been distinctly informed, that body was part of his essence; that however fruitful he was, and however much he multiplied, all that came from him should be in the same state of glory as he was, if he continued in it; that it was God's intention, by means of matter drawn from himself, to send souls into being, whose condition wholly depended upon his obedience; and that, as God had made flesh a part of the essence of man, if the one part came from a parent corrupted by sin, then that part of his essence which God creates at the same time, would be punished by a coordinate corruption. Nor does it seem wrong to say, that as men were made in the image of God, in a way in which angels were not, but were able to be like God, not in other things only, but also in generating sons like themselves, it was reasonable to demand of the first source of our race, that he should be careful to preserve for all the image<sup>a</sup> he was authorized to transmit; and that as it was out of the scope of God's design in creating for un-

<sup>a</sup> See Petav. de Trinit. vi. 5. §. 9. de O. S. D. ii. 3. §. 4. who considers man is only spoken of by Moses as in God's image, because Moses only wrote of the visible creation. It does not, however, appear why the

power as such, of producing his like should not be looked upon as part of the original image, though the *act* of doing so has since the fall become too allied to sin to associate with the image.

embodied spirits to propagate their like, so it is in harmony with that scope, for the state of embodied spirits to be made dependent upon the state which their first forefather voluntarily selected.

9. For aught we know, the transmigration of souls may be therefore impossible, because each particular soul<sup>b</sup> is exactly coordinate to each particular body, and incapable of animating any other. And if this be so, then there may be some law, by which it is not only impossible for human souls to come into existence without bodies, but also impossible for corruptible bodies to have else than corrupted wills to animate them. But however the justice of God ought to be vindicated in punishing Adam, it is certain that the enormity<sup>c</sup> of the punishment is a clear proof of the boundless enormity of Adam's guilt. A just and merciful being could never have inflicted such awfully severe punishment, except for some most wilful and abominably enormous sin against light and knowledge. And it is very possible, that Adam gratified his self-will with a distinct and full insight into the meaning of the words, 'thou shalt surely die.' If he was conscious of the position he held in the universe, and knew that flesh and soul so made up human nature by God's ordinance, that flesh belongs to its essence; if he knew that

<sup>b</sup> St. Thomas, pt. i. q. 29. art. 1. ad 5. says, the soul when separate is not a person, because it retains its capacity for union, and probably what may be said of soul generally, may be said of each soul in particular: it retains a capacity of union towards a particular body, restorable to it by divine power. V. Aristot. de Animâ i. cap. 3. fin. p. 407.

b. 24. Bekk. Jambl. de Myst. i. 9. Orig. c. Cels. p. 203. Spens. Nyssen. i. p. 125. d. Rust. Diac. p. 810. e. Leont. c. Nest. ap. Mai. p. 472.

<sup>c</sup> Aug. Op. imp. vi. 23. 'cur non quantitatem culpæ, de quâ homines judicare non possunt, judicante Judice incomparabiliter justo, de pœnæ granditate metiris?' cf. ch. 21. and 27.

he was to produce other essences like himself by marriage, and yet tasted with his body the forbidden fruit, while with his soul he broke at the same time the command of his God; then we have before us an enormous sin, worthy of the enormous punishment inflicted on its perpetrator. But sinful flesh is flesh inhabited by a sinful soul, and by this rule untainted flesh ought to be flesh inhabited by an untainted soul. If the Anti-Monothelite writers had been liberal of such epithets, as 'untainted,' 'all-untainted,' 'all-blameless,' 'unpolluted,' and the like, to *other* virgins, then it might be said, that their words could not be made to imply any thing special in regard to God's Mother's soul; but as they were not, we may conclude, that in gazing at the untainted will of that soul, which God created in hypostatic union with himself, they very naturally looked off to the part of Christ which was taken from Mary. In this part they saw a flesh perfectly coordinate with that divine soul: and their minds looked back to the flesh it was taken from, i. e. to Mary's flesh, to see what the faith which was in them would dictate to them to say of that flesh of Mary, which once had been physically united with, and joined to, Christ's flesh while in the womb<sup>d</sup>. They used words of one of the coordinate elements of Mary's human nature, which imply something about the other. Her flesh could not be untainted, spotless, unpolluted, all-spotless, all-untainted, without her whole human nature being as like to God's human nature as was possible. The Greek Fathers, in so speaking of

<sup>d</sup> Hence Anast. Sinasta, V. D. p. 138-9. speaks *as if* Mary and Christ were then one hypostasis. In the eye of the Roman law they would be one person, but subsequent errors have made such a way of speaking dangerous and improper. See vol. i. p. 390. n. t.

Mary's flesh, were only assigning the premisses for the conclusion St. Martin had stated about her whole human nature.

10. It is then of the utmost importance to shew, (as far as may be,) that the Almighty Disposer of events so ordered the course of his Providence, as to force the eyes of the whole creation to gaze upon the connecting link between Pelagianism and Monothelitism. If the East did not bear in mind the connection between perfect purity of body and of soul, then what has just been said, is to no purpose. If, on the contrary, it can be most distinctly shewn, that they were driven by the apparent fall of Honorius to gaze upon the bearing of these two heresies on each other, and the light thrown by the Catholic principles evolved by the former on those required for the latter, something will have been done. God darkened St. Thomas's and St. Joseph's mind to confirm the faith the more: it may be, that the cloud he suffered to hang over Honorius's infallibility, tends to the same good end. Now the acute and holy Maximus has informed us, how Honorius came to be able to connive at heresy as he did. He made statements about our Lord's will, which were true in the sense he meant them, namely, as opposed to Pelagianism, but false as opposed to Monothelitism. Whether he saw it or not, whether for the hope of peace he purposely used an ambiguous word or not, two things are certain; one is, that the word 'will' is ambiguous; and the other is, that Honorius used it himself in the orthodox sense. That the word is ambiguous, is plain from the English as well as the Latin or Greek: for we speak of 'will,' when we mean the thing willed, and also in a different sense, when we mean the faculty by which we will. A parallel



instance may be found in the word 'imagination'; which means both the faculty and the produce of that faculty. Thus, a man of strong imagination may produce in any particular case a very weak imagination. And something in this way, a will contradistinguished from and even contrary to the divine will, may produce a will conformable to it. When Christ wished the cup to pass from him, he allowed his human will to feel contrary to his divine will, if by will we mean the power or faculty of willing. When he said, 'not my will but thine be done,' he shewed a will in perfect conformity with the divine will: in this case the word 'will' is used to express the actual produce of his faculty of willing. The former he did to prove to us that he had all that belongs to our original nature, the latter to shew that the produce of the will belonging to that nature was not contrary to the divine will. In the latter sense Honorius's expression is orthodox, in the former it is heretical. In the latter sense it is Anti-Pelagian, in the former it is Monophysite. That the word then which he used was capable of an orthodox or of a heretical meaning, is plain.

11. That he himself used it in an orthodox meaning is clear, from the following statement of St. Maximus, which is thought by his learned editor Combefis to have induced the Greeks to alter their opinion of Honorius: for some MSS. of the sixth Council are found without the insertion of the name of Honorius amongst the list of heretics. In the disputation with the Archbishop of Constantinople, Pyrrhus says, 'What have you to say to Honorius, who plainly asserted to my predecessor [Sergius] the doctrine of one will in our Lord Jesus Christ?' Maximus. 'Who

<sup>f</sup> Anselm. de lib. arb. cap. vii. illustrates from 'sight.'

is a trustworthy interpreter of this sort of epistle? he who put it together in Honorius's presence, who is alive still, and along with his other good qualities enlightens all the West with his orthodox doctrines; or people in Constantinople, who speak out of the abundance of their own heart? Pyrrhus. 'He who put it together.' Maximus. 'Well then, this same person in a letter to the holy Constantine, who is become emperor, in the presence again of John the holy Pope, writes and says: We spoke of one will in the Lord, not meaning it of his divinity and humanity, but of his humanity only. For as Sergius had written that certain persons speak of two contrary<sup>g</sup> wills in Christ, we wrote back, "Christ had not two contrary wills, to wit, of the flesh and of the spirit, as *we have after the transgression*, but one only, viz. that which is by nature a characteristic of his humanity<sup>h</sup>." And in another treatise, speaking of the same thing, to the question, 'In what sense did Honorius say one will?' he replies: 'Clearly because it was from the Godhead that our nature, not sin, was taken, that is, it was not from sin [that it was taken].' In this he all but follows the words of the great Athanasius, when writing against the impious Apollinarius as follows: "He was born of a woman, raising himself up a nature from man's original condition, with a manifestation of flesh without fleshly willings and human reasonings, with an image of newness: for there is one will only of the Godhead, since the nature thereof is also one only. For of the generation of the Word after the flesh for our sakes the procedure was in a way above us: inasmuch as it was not the impassioned willing or reasoning of the flesh that

<sup>g</sup> Sergius's words are noticed  
by Palma, l. c. p. 122.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. ii. p. 181.

led the way to it, as is seen in our case owing to that pleasure, which, through the deceit [of Satan], lords over our race, but the will of the Godhead alone." Upon this shewing, it is clear that what Honorius meant, when he denied that there was a contrariety of wills in Christ, was the act of the will, the will, that is, as a product of the one soul willing. I am not in the least trying to exculpate him for not using more unambiguous language : all I wish to shew is, that his meaning clearly was to himself a perfectly orthodox one. The<sup>1</sup> controversy of the Three Chapters had led men naturally to be forward in denying that opposition of wills in Christ, which the arch-heretic Theodorus, the master of Nestorius and Pelagius, had maintained. Honorius might possibly suppose, or pretend if you please to suppose, that Sergius wished to know, if he could hold two wills in that sense, as Sergius in his letter craftily pretends ; and to this Honorius could reply in the negative, without hurting his infallibility on a doctrinal point. As to mere matter of fact, nobody claims infallibility for him upon that.

12. Hence then it is plain, that an appearance of a fall (and I call it such, because some Greeks<sup>j</sup> it seems fancied it was a fall) from infallibility, and conduct really enough to superinduce the condemnation of a General Council, (no more infallible than he on such matters of fact,) and the severe censure of a subsequent Pope, were things of a nature to draw men's minds especially to the relation of Pelagian and Anti-Pelagian, to Monophysite and Anti-Monophysite, teaching. If the Church had not first

<sup>i</sup> Pagi, l. c. p. 403. shews, the two wills.

that at the same time he had  
exacted of some more sus-  
pected parties a profession of

<sup>j</sup> e. g. Germanus ap. Mai.  
Spic. vii. p. 52.

vanquished Pelagius, it might have been difficult to express in a way to avoid misunderstanding the state of Christ's human will. But if God allowed Satan to attack her first with Pelagianism, which was still in being and engaged the attention of Popes, we can see, frail as we are, that this providence enabled her to tread more surely, in her stand against Monothelitism, which, as we have seen, Satan was ready to ply against her from the first<sup>k</sup>. The purity of Christ's flesh, and its exemption from the law of sin, is brought most strongly out by the Nestorian and Pelagian controversy: the purity of his will by the Monothelite. The misconduct of Honorius forces us to notice the relationship of Pelagianism to Monothelitism, and to see how completely a perfect integrity of soul and of body in Christ are correlatives. But the Monothelite controversy also brought before the world, that it was only necessary for Christ to take flesh from a person of the same nature as ourselves: for no one has his soul from his mother, though it is also true that unless Christ had had a soul, he would not have had *our* nature, nor have been Son of Mary. But the corruption in our wills, and the law of sin in our flesh, might be clean removed from that person, and still he could take our nature. Hence all the magnificent epithets bestowed upon Mary's flesh in the course of the Monophysite controversy, lead us to infer something in regard to her soul. If we say that God so ordered things on purpose to bring Mary's dignity out of the hearts of the faithful into the eyes of the world, we may be framing a theory, but it is a consistent and intelligible theory. The world knew already from Anti-Pelagian doctors, that the law of sin in the members lived, and moved,

<sup>k</sup> Above, p. 364. n. e.



and had its being through a corruption of the will connate with the flesh: Anti-Monothelite writers knew this, and yet they exempt the blood of Mary from taint, and make her flesh unpolluted. If they did not do this on purpose to lead us to believe that her will too never had the curse of the fall upon it, at any rate they unconsciously help us in that direction<sup>1</sup>. Either they knew what they were about, or God foresaw what was coming, or else he was not with his Church always to the end of the world. If they knew that Pelagians had made Christ's flesh subject to the law of sin, yet spoke of Mary's flesh in a way which naturally leads us to suppose, that they exempted her flesh from the taint of sin; it is natural also to infer, that they had some such opinion of her soul as would make it as like as possible to Christ's. The controversy brought before them the fact, that a perfectly pure body and a perfectly pure soul were correlatives; and in the face of this they assert strongly and repeatedly the perfect purity of Mary's flesh, which must necessarily induce men to regard Mary as a human nature, as like as possible to Christ's. This, as we have seen, is just what St. Martin and St. Sophronius did assert of it: and St. Martin anathematizes those who do not put it above every human nature, except Christ. Hence it is clear he put it above the Baptist's, who was sanctified in the womb.

13. Having then considered the bearing of the controversies touching the Incarnation upon the Immaculate Conception, we find that they furnish evidence of the truth of a position laid down in the commencement of this work<sup>m</sup>. That position is this:

<sup>1</sup> Sophronius, l. c. given in lessness to the soul.  
 §. 4. expressly extends the spot- <sup>m</sup> Part i. chap. i. §. 5. &c.

that Catholic doctrine viewed from without is a philosophic structure, at which eighteen centuries have been building. That which the last century added does not destroy what the one before it built: that which this again built, leaves the work of its predecessor untouched, and so on down to the time of apostles and prophets. Or conversely, the first century laid foundations for the second, the second for the third, and so on up to our day. By what skill the first century contrived to lay foundations for the rest—or how Anti-Pelagian writers in the fifth century came to furnish a substratum exactly suited for Anti-Monothelite writers in the seventh, and these again unintentionally to treat of the Blessed Virgin's flesh just in a way suited, even if not at all intended, to give a meaning to the words used at Frankfurt<sup>n</sup>, and to help later writers to her Immaculate Conception, does not appear, unless the builder and maker of this structure was God the Holy Ghost. The names of Trinity, hypostasis, original sin, Mother of God, and many other names, are hard to find in the first centuries: but for all that, the things signified may have been in the hearts of Christians from the first. Here we are simply considering the structure which came before the world: and maintaining its wonderful consistency to be a proof of its divine origin wholly distinct from proofs, if any such there be, of its antiquity. Read St. Athanasius's Epistle to Epictetus, or his works against Apollinaris, and you are sure, if you know St. Austin, that he would have delighted in them, had he had them to read, if it were only for their statements about original sin. Again, when you know how St. Austin did avoid attributing sin to the Blessed Virgin, you may feel convinced St. Sophronius

<sup>n</sup> Above, chap. ii. §. 10.

or St. Maximus would not have scandalized him, when they spoke of her untainted blood, at the very time they were speaking of the sinlessness of Christ's will. When you have considered the wonderful union of sentiment implied in this, go on if you please to the Council of Frankfurt, and you will find them distinctly talking of the second Adam's creation 'from a better earth, animate and immaculate,' better, i. e. than that virgin earth out of which Adam was made. Who, but a Socinian, doubts that St. John believed the Trinity, though he never mentions the word; or St. Peter original sin, or St. Paul the difference between substance and hypostasis? It is possible, that the language of Athanasius, Cyril, or Augustine on these subjects might, at first hearing, have sounded harsh to Apostles, though we feel sure when explained to them, they would have agreed about the things. In a similar way it is credible enough, that the mere language used by us of Mary's privileges might not sound natural to the patristic antiquary, though perfectly fair exponents of a doctrine in harmony with what is contained in the writings of the Fathers.

## CHAP. VIII.

UPON THE ASSUMPTION AND CORONATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

1. THE words, ‘*Monstra te esse Matrem*,’ are not unfrequently in the mouths of protestants, as words which they fancy bring before a person, in a concise and tangible form, that which they object to in ‘the worship of the Virgin.’ They suppose them to mean, ‘Shew your authority over your Son, and make him do what we want.’ Now they need only be asked to read the next words, to enable them to see<sup>a</sup>, that what we there ask of the Blessed Virgin is to shew herself a Mother to us. But as the Catholic does seem to ascribe to the Blessed Mother of God a power different, not in degree only, but in kind, to that which Saints and Angels exercise by their prayers upon Almighty God the Son, let us proceed to consider, whether what they imagine to be the sense of these words is or is not contained, though not in that hymn, still in the hearts of Catholics.

2. Now I suppose no devout protestant would feel any great repugnancy to allowing that our Lord as man, and by virtue of the perfectness of his manhood, might shew respect as to Joseph and Mary, so also to Saints or Angels. Thus, if our Lord had saluted

<sup>a</sup> *Monstra te esse Matrem!*  
*Sumat per te preces,*  
*Qui pro nobis natus*  
*Tulit esse tuus.*



Moses and Elias respectfully, while he was transfigured, or had thanked the Angel who strengthened him at his Agony, I suppose such conduct would not seem unbecoming in him, even to a protestant, if he was but tolerably free from any Nestorian tendencies. And the ground of such reverence would be, because the Son when he took our nature, took it with all its unblameworthy affections, among which, respect for superior orders of beings, or for those otherwise superior to us, is one. This would (it is imagined) not unready be conceded to our Blessed Saviour, while he was in the condition of a traveller upon earth. The Catholic indeed acknowledges, that our Lord combined this state with the enjoyment of the beatific vision, and conceives no soul, not even Mary's<sup>b</sup>, to have enjoyed this privilege of combining the two, or to have been as high as that, which from its first creation had always been in union with the divine Nature. Hence any such reverence paid by our Lord even to the highest of beings has to the Catholic a mysterious dignity, which to the protestant it scarcely can be said to have,—a dignity attaching to it, even though it be remembered most distinctly, that Christ was yet also in the state of a traveller. But the protestant supposes that we give Mary a power of commanding, as if by virtue of holy obedience, even the glorified human nature of our Lord. This is the 'shocking doctrine,' which is supposed to be so repugnant to those scriptural statements, which announce to us, that after Christ's Ascension his Name was above every other name, and every principality and power was in subjection to him. It seems to the protestants then to be wholly out of the scope of the scriptural doctrine,

<sup>b</sup> Vide Suarez. in part iii. tom. 2. disp. 4. §. 1.

to, ascribe to the ascended Saviour any power whatever of venerating any creature, in any manner whatever.

3. Now as I wish not only to put the matter before the reader in a clearer light, but also to *keep* it before him as long as I can, I will state as frankly as I can what opinions I should run into myself if I were left to my own meditations upon the matter. In the first place, I have stated my belief, that the habits of affection formed in this life would continue in the next, not only in the wicked, but also in the good<sup>c</sup>: and therefore if Mary is in heaven, her Son would continue to love her there, and to exert, so far as the change of circumstances admits, all those habits towards her, which he had towards her upon earth. In the next place, I should take it for granted, that *if* it was open to him to shew any respect now to Joseph, John the Baptist, David, or Abraham, it is clear that he would shew a much greater to his Mother. Thirdly, it does not seem to me to involve any absurdity to suppose our Saviour capable, even in his glorious state, of shewing acts of homage, in and by his human nature, to the creatures of his grace. Thus if a man had fought a long fight for Christ's sake, and died full of good works and ripe for glory; and any one were to ask me, What sort of reception or hospitality he was likely to meet with upon his egress from this life to the crown of justice ready for him? I would reply, our Saviour will receive him with every mark of homage and respect, and act the servant towards such a Saint as this; or in his own words, 'Amen I say to you, Christ, in spite of his glorified nature, will gird himself, and make him

<sup>c</sup> Part i. chap. xv. §. 13—16.

sit down, and passing to and fro, will wait upon him<sup>d</sup>. Whatever the Church might think of such a notion, at any rate, the protestant could not say it was very unscriptural. Whatever respect was thus shewn to the Saint, it is clear that more would be shewn to the Mother. What I should have to prove would be, that his Mother is in heaven, and was early held to be there, and then I conceive I should have made out a plausible proof at least for the protestant sense of the 'Monstra te esse Matrem.' That some persons or other would not credit the possibility of such condescension, our Lord (I might argue) seems to have foreseen : otherwise he would not have confirmed it with an oath, "Amen I say to you." If he dealt so with one who was to be the patron saint of some ten cities, much more honour would he shew to the Queen of queens!

4. What I have to shew then is, that Mary is in heaven; and this it is plain that Christians always held. For in the third century, Methodius<sup>e</sup>, treating of the woman clothed with the sun, spoken of in the Apocalypse, combats the opinion of those who take it of the Blessed Virgin. This shews, that that opinion therefore was already in existence, and that they thought the Blessed Virgin was there, and interpreted the passage by means of a tradition to that effect : all that St. Methodius objects to is, the assertion that this passage in particular can be explained by that already existing belief. What he thinks is, that St. John saw a visional representation of what was happening in regard to the Church. Hence (I might observe) he would take the three years and a half of residence in the desert of I know

<sup>d</sup> Luke xii. 37. and comp. Apoc. iii. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Conviv. V. viii. 4. 5. or p. 108. ed. Leo Allat.

not what mystical number, and not of the residence of our Lady in Egypt, during that period which intervened between her flight and Herod's death. He takes it for granted, I might add, that it was not possible, or not likely, for things past to be shewn in a vision. To the other interpretation Epiphanius<sup>s</sup> evidently inclines, when hesitating between the prophecy of Simeon, which ascribed in his view death to her, and this passage, which appears to ascribe immortality. But it is unnecessary to discuss what is the real meaning of this passage, so long as we remember, that it did not appear absurd to Christians of the third century to represent our Lady as clothed with the sun, as having the moon under her feet, and crowns of twelve stars upon her head. If one of these Christians had been a painter, and had represented our Lady in this way, would not protestants have thought that the man was a Romanist even then, and that there was already need of the Reformation? If he had said, Why the Liturgies, wherever I have been, put her before all other creatures; he would have been told to go by the Bible only. If he had replied, Let me interpret the Apocalypse then as I please; he would have given an uncomfortable answer.

5. Others have considered, that the vision referred to both our Lady and the Church; so unwilling were they to relinquish all idea that Mary was meant by it, even when they had been induced, perhaps by the arguments in favour of Methodius's view, to relinquish the application of it to our Lady solely. "As for this woman," says Aretas, a writer of the tenth century, "some [of those before him] have taken the vision to refer to our Lord's Mother, and by

<sup>s</sup> Epiph. i. p. 1043.



reference<sup>b</sup> to point out events relating to Antichrist shortly to come to pass<sup>i</sup>." And the writer de Symbolo, among St. Austin's works, adopted a similar interpretation long before Aretas's time; he takes, that is, Mary as a type of the Church, and supposes, that of course what is represented of her implies, as a type, something farther. Such a view from a writer of the fifth century, as in all probability this writer was<sup>k</sup>, implies the existence of a belief in the West also, that Mary was in heaven, unless indeed any one should choose to say, that she was, even while on earth, clothed with the sun, and had the moon under her feet, and crowns of the twelve stars upon her head. This interpretation, then, seems to assume thus much, that the Virgin Mary was shewn to St. John in glory, and that what was really there, was presented to him, as a type of what was to come. Mary had had her troubles and persecutions and sorrows upon earth, in rearing the Saviour of the world: she has now come out of these great tribulations, and is clothed in glorious apparel, clothed upon by Christ himself, the Sun of justice, and has power over the whole of this changeable world, or the Church on earth, (whichever<sup>l</sup> the

<sup>b</sup> See part i. chap. xiii. §. 17.

<sup>i</sup> Aret. in Apoc. p. 351. οἱ μὲν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου μητέρα ὑπέλαβον τὴν ὀπτασίαν ἀναφέρονσαν δεῖξαι τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀντίχριστον πρὸ βράχως διεξελθόν, (i. ἅπερ βράχως δεῖ ἐξελθῖν). Any one who knows the intense carelessness of Dr. Cramer's editions, will excuse a few little emendations to elicit a sense. Or it might have been, α. π. β. διεξῆλθον, but either will do for our purpose.

<sup>k</sup> As may be inferred from the way he speaks of the Arians as a dominant power. v. fin. See the Bened. præf. to these discourses. I do not give the words here, as they have been referred to above, chap. iv. fin.

<sup>l</sup> These are interpretations, which, whether acceptable now-a-days or not, were common in ancient times. See Lauretus Sylva Alleg. in v. Luna.

borrowed light of the changing moon may signify;) and has all the honours bestowed on those who reign with Christ over the Gentiles<sup>m</sup>, bestowed upon her. In like manner the Church shall have her troubles, while (as St. Paul speaks) Christ is being formed in her: Satan will persecute her either by external or internal fightings, but she will prevail, and come eventually to glory. This seems no unnatural meaning to put on the passage: St. John had seen Mary in her lowest abyss of tribulation, and therefore, as far as his own wants went, the sight of her in glory would be the best possible mode of bringing home to his mind the transitoriness of the sufferings, and the certainty of the glory of the Church. The Temple of God is opened in heaven, the Ark of the Covenant (a common name for Mary with us) is seen: thunders, voices, and quakings<sup>n</sup>, and hail, are the harbingers which introduce the Queen of Angels, and she comes forth in glorious apparel at once the Mother of the Church, and the earnest of its glories. Whether St. John thought he saw a vision when he saw a reality, or not, need not be determined here; as all that is just here contended for is, that many early Christians understood this passage of Mary.

6. These two passages from Methodius and a writer of St. Austin's school shew, that it was believed early that our Lady was in heaven, and in great glory there. If they had been in some protestant writers, who do not believe that the saints reach heaven before the day of judgment<sup>o</sup>, they

<sup>m</sup> Apoc. ii. 27, 28.

<sup>n</sup> How the *earth* could quake in *heaven*, St. Jerome must decide for himself: the Greek has only σεισμός. He probably meant

to use a special term for 'shaking,' in a general sense.

<sup>o</sup> The learned Dr. Laurence, protestant Abp. of Cashel, even wrote a treatise to *prove*, that

would not be worth much ; but as they come from writers when such a notion was unheard of in Christianity, they have their weight. All, however, that they prove is, that the soul of Mary was held to be there in great glory. In regard to her body, they neither prove nor disprove any thing. A vision of God is brought about by impressions addressed to the senses, or to the imagination, remembering things from the senses. A vision therefore of Mary, David, or St. John, would probably address itself to him who received it through impressions analogous to those made upon the senses. When the Angel appeared to Manoe, doubtless he appeared in a human form, but of course this vision would not prove that he had a body. So neither will the vision in the Apocalypse, if addressed to St. John's senses in the mode here supposed, prove that those who so understood that passage, thereby implied that the body of Mary was in heaven. Whether they believed this or not, is a thing to be settled by other evidence than this : and in default of all direct evidence, we must be content with such evidence, as will shew us what they probably would have said upon the subject.

7. Now there was a belief early existing in some parts of the Church, that will throw some light upon this point. It was thought by some, that the other person who stood at the foot of the Cross, St. John, was received body and soul into heaven. St. Thomas<sup>p</sup> mentions it as a pious belief common in his days. St. Ambrose and St. Austin<sup>q</sup> mention,

the souls of the faithful are not in *sleeping* state. This shows how little the invisible world is known to the faith of protestants.

<sup>p</sup> Tract. vi. in Symb. vol. xvii. p. 68.

<sup>q</sup> In Ps. cxviii. cap. 20. §. 12. In Joan. tr. cxxiv. 1, 2, 3. Cf. a Lapide in loc. p. 553.

that some persons doubted whether St. John ever died. This is the form in which also we find the first allusion in antiquity to Mary's Assumption: St. Epiphanius expresses a doubt if she ever died. It may be said, St. John himself, when he says, 'non dixit Jesus non moritur,' anticipates and refutes such a notion. But it is easier to believe, that St. John's humility availed itself of what Jesus did *not* say, to elude ascribing any thing remarkable to himself, than it is to get rid of the impression, that the words of Jesus naturally meant, and actually did promise, something remarkable. That neither he nor Mary suffered martyrdom, in the common sense of the word, is universally believed. Whether he really was raised to life again<sup>a</sup>, need not be discussed here. It is sufficient to observe the existence of a certain animus in the Church implied by this tradition, and that animus implies a desire to ascribe to a very special favourite of Christ the continuance of his bodily existence. "Some," says St. Ambrose, "have doubted of his death: of his passage through the fire (which guards paradise) none can doubt, because he is in paradise, and is not separated from Christ." The question is, what induced these 'some' to doubt of his death: it should seem they must have had some parallel case to go by, and that a case existing under the New Covenant. Mary's Assumption, if believed, would be a case in point. Neither the miracle of the earth moving at his tomb, (which St. Austin says he had on no mean

<sup>a</sup> Whether the appearance of Mary and John together to Gregory Thaumaturgus will throw any thing into this scale, 'judicent peritiores.'

Perhaps there is no other Saint who has appeared so often to others upon earth with Mary as St. John.



authority,) nor the case of Elias and Enoch, each universally believed, nor the case of Moses by some supposed, to have his body still, seems to afford sufficient grounds for the existence of such a belief, unless there had been some parallel under the New Covenant which led people to take up such a notion. That many held Mary to be in heaven in some way, we have seen: that the supposition that she was believed to be there, in body as well as in soul, will account for this fancy about St. John, is what is here contended for. What we really rest our belief of the Assumption upon is, of course, the received opinion of the Church, that the body of Mary is in heaven, and not upon such slight probabilities as this. But where there is no proof, either one way or the other, that Mary's body was then believed to be in heaven, and there is proof that she was believed to be there, then whether she was believed to be there in body, may be made probable by what was believed about St. John. It is no matter whether this latter belief was false or true; people who maintained it, must have had in all probability some Christian analogy to go by. The text of St. John would certainly have done as much to destroy, as to originate, the fancy; and it probably came from some other source. The analogy of the blessed Virgin may have been that source: in this way, what several believed of St. John becomes a presumption, as to what was believed of Mary.

8. There is indeed another belief, not uncommon in early ages, which would furnish an analogy to go by in the matter; but if it shews how this idea touching St. John came to gain currency, it will also shew, that to suppose our Lady to have risen again and gone into heaven, was not to suppose an ex-

ception in her case, such as the early ages would have found discordant with their theology. But it is the object of this work to shew, not so much the existence (in early ages) of our present feelings in regard to our Lady, upon which we have not documents enough to decide by, as to shew the consistency of these feelings with belief, which we have documents to prove. Now it was not uncommonly believed, that the dead bodies of the Saints which rose at our Lord's resurrection went into Jerusalem, that is above; though they appeared also in that which is below, and retained the bodies they had recovered<sup>r</sup>. To believe this, is to believe the resurrection and ascension of many, which makes the resurrection and ascension of one, easy to believe, especially when that one is the Mother of flesh already in Heaven, and is believed also to be clothed with Christ, to have the Church under her feet, and the crowns of all the Apostles. It is not credible that these ancient Christians would allow so much to Christ's servants, and deny the same to his Mother. It may be added, that there is no Scripture authority for saying Mary was present at Christ's ascension: perhaps he, who was to draw all things unto him when lifted up, found a kind of sweet necessity to keep the flesh of Mary away from that which had such an attraction for it. Of course he could have disposed it otherwise, but it is for those who go by Scripture only, to account otherwise for her absence,

<sup>r</sup> Vide a Lapide ad Matt. xxvii. 52. Vallars. ad Hieron. Epist. lx. §. 3. Tillemont, vol. i. n. 15. p. 107. Certainly 'the Church of the first-born,' and 'the spirits of the just,' seem a most useless tautology, if

they do not mean two things, in Heb. xii. 23. But I cannot recall to mind where I have seen the Church of the first-born applied to those raised at the Crucifixion.

Scripture not mentioning her presence. It is (so to say) like our Lord, to act in and through natural channels, and not to dispense with them. She who was left on earth to draw the holy Spirit down at Pentecost, might have been herself drawn up, had she been present at the Ascension.

9. In the works of Pseudo-Dionysius there seems to be but one solitary passage, which is supposed to mention the blessed Virgin for her own sake: the only other mention made of her by this Eutychianizing writer is to do Gabriel honour. She has no place in this impostor's Hierarchy, for reasons obvious enough, as has been said already, to those who allow of the Eutychian tendencies of that writer, and agree with what has been said above about the feeling of Eutychianism towards Mary. In that one place he talks of the Apostles coming together for the sight of the life-beginning and God-receiving body. Some have conjectured, that a letter, only a single letter, is wrong in the Greek<sup>s</sup>; and that for 'body,' we should read 'sepulchre.' The mistake, if such, is certainly an ancient one; for Pseudo-Maximus says, *perhaps* he means the body of the holy Mother of God. And St. John Damascene quotes the passage for the purpose of proving the Assumption. As a great follower of Maximus, however, he would naturally take up with what he thought his view of the passage: so until we have a really critical edition of Denys, such a questionable allusion is only worth noticing, to shew that the passage has not been forgotten. The reading of *σήματος* appears to me to be more natural than the other: persons prepossessed in this pretender's favour, would not unnaturally put a letter different to make

\* Page 539, *σήματος* for *σώματος*. See above, p. 136.

the passage less capable of a Eutychian meaning. However, the practice of the whole Church, East and West, is so to honour the Assumption as if she believed it: in the visions of the Saints this belief has been confirmed: there is nothing in antiquity to furnish any clear argument against it: there are analogies enough to shew, that there was nothing contrary to the faith of early Christians in such a belief. But what the Church universally believes, must be written upon her heart by the finger of that God, who makes men to be of one mind in a house; and therefore the Church might address criticism as Antigone did Creon;

Neither so puissant think I thy decrees,  
That thou of mortal birth, canst overbear  
The unwritten and unfaltering rules of God.  
For neither now nor yesterday their life  
Had its beginning, but at every time  
It was: and no man wotteth whence they came<sup>†</sup>.

10. The proof then here alleged for the Assumption, is the teaching and practice of the Church: it has no existence (that I know of) in early historical documents<sup>‡</sup>, but it does not follow from that, that in reality neither the thing nor the belief had an early existence. Things more credible receive a proof, says St. Austin, from things less credible already believed. It is less credible that many of the Saints should have risen, than that the Queen of all Saints should have risen. It is less absurd to suppose that in the days of *disciplina arcani*, some things virtually

<sup>†</sup> Sophocl. Antig. l. 453.

<sup>‡</sup> It is worth noticing, that Trombelli has several times cited Cyril Lucaris as Cyril of Alexandria, and in this way contrived to make the latter a good authority for the Assump-

tion. See vol. iv. p. 326. 332. and 374. v. p. 160. p. 213. This is a strange mistake, but such it is: for Trombelli is a most honest writer, if he is excessively prosy.



at least held by the Church, should have left scarce any outward trace of their existence, than to suppose that God should have gone on for ten centuries, allowing minds of gigantic grasp and souls of wonder-working purity to cling to an error, and hold it before their own minds every day of their life, and preach it to others. The Church's teaching then being the real ground of my own belief, I have not thought it worth while to compel unwilling passages to give questionable testimony, or to bribe spurious authors to give evidence under a false name, in favour of the pious belief. If so learned a prelate as Benedict the XIVth saw no sufficient grounds<sup>u</sup> for making this an article of faith, persons of moderate acquirements may reasonably forbear to urge passages, which cannot be proved to belong to those centuries, for which protestantism retains some vestige at least of respect. Yet as the same great authority has pronounced it to be rash to say any thing against what is so universally received, even though it be not an article of faith, it seemed not improper to put together a few points which help to shew the internal consistency of this belief with other things held in early times to be credible. And in this view, one or two other antecedent probabilities in its favour may be deserving of notice. This is done for the sake of those who, not having yet submitted to the only lively oracle of God, the Church, require somewhat to help to make her doctrines attractive.

11. The controversies about the Incarnation necessarily led to displaying what the Church felt and believed about the glories of Mary. The later doctors concerned in this controversy were led, as we have seen, to the use of very strong epithets to

<sup>u</sup> De Festis B. M. V. viii. §. 18.

express the purity of Mary's flesh—epithets much the same as they apply to the Eucharist, or even to the Holy Trinity. That 'godly Bishop,' Epiphanius, in controverting\* those who depreciated the Blessed Virgin, declines saying whether or no she was dead, and expresses his belief, that the wings said to be given to her to escape from the dragon, *may* mean that she never died. This will of course imply, that they *may* mean that she was translated to heaven: for the word 'was taken' has that technical sense both in the Old and New Testament. Now to omit altogether the objections which may be easily raised to this interpretation of St. John's words, and to confine ourselves to St. Epiphanius's sentiment, it is clear that he thought it likely that she never died, and that in his view 'to escape the dragon' and 'not to die' were synonymous. Death then he regarded as the consequence of sin: he does not here discuss how far, if it was open to the Blessed Virgin to accept or reject death: this was one of those consequences of sin, which might be blamelessly accepted. Still it would seem also that he regarded a soul separate from its body, as in an imperfect state of existence. The humanity of our Saviour himself might be said to be in an imperfect state of existence while he was in the grave. As this state did not become him, St. Peter says it was impossible for him to be held by it†. We can imagine our Lord submitting to this degradation for a brief period—nay, we must believe it: but we could not imagine him in such an imperfect state for the several centuries which elapse between his death and the judgment. Nay, the ascent of his flesh into heaven is made in some way the condition of his giving gifts to men. If therefore this be so,

\* As above, p. 390. n. g.

† Acts ii. 24.

all those passages of the Fathers which ascribe to Mary the most perfect human nature after Christ's; all those places which specially signalize her immunity from actual sin; all the texts which assign to her the office of Paraclete or Advocate next to Christ, or speak of her putting on her Son's glory; all that in any way intimate the perfect immaculateness of her flesh, or (its almost essentially necessary coordinate) the absolute spotlessness of her soul; may be at least said to lisp of her assumption into heaven<sup>2</sup>. They do their very best to make the idea, that a dutiful and omnipotent Son left her flesh to rot and be devoured by loathsome worms, refused to give her soul back the heart which had supplied him with blood, the breasts which had satisfied him with milk, the hands that had dressed his helpless infancy, the feet that had carried his embryo love to the Baptist, and the womb in which he had passed his early days of redeeming condescension—so united to her *flesh* as to seem one person with it—refused to put that flesh in heaven, and make it able to transmit the graces his own sacrificed flesh was winning evermore—I say, they do their very best to make such an idea revolting, odious, and disgustful to every feeling of gratitude the human breast is capable of. It is not easy to see how the liberal Saviour, who swore to reward the gift of a cup of cold water to the meanest disciple, could refrain from repaying the maternal offices of Mary with the choicest gift he could bestow. Nor will the delay of centuries savour much of that filial gratitude, which is one of the unblameable affections of human nature. Let those who feel any repugnance

<sup>2</sup> August. Serm. de Asc. premit spiritum sarcina peccatorum, 263. §. 2. Facile corpus levatur in alta cœlorum, si non

at believing the flesh of Mary to be glorified, cautiously enquire of their consciences, what is their habitual and daily belief about the flesh of Christ. For it may be that they have no rooted habitual belief that that flesh is in heaven, which ought to have Mary's beside it.

12. Moreover, it may be noticed, how completely this belief falls in with all that has been said in this work upon the *habit* of reverence to Mary, Christ spent so many years in obtaining. If it really is true, that Christ meant to use the flesh of Mary as the channel of the blessings he would bestow from heaven, (though not, of course, of those he gives personally in the Sacrament of the Altar,) then it becomes in a measure intelligible, why he should have spent so much time in qualifying, by his sanctifying presence, the Mother of all living for her future office. It is commonly believed, that the present worthy reception of the Saviour in the Sacrament, in some way sows the seed of glory in the bodies of the recipients, and this though that presence be but transient; how much then must thirty years of continual presence with Mary have done to qualify her body for glory? Remove that body from heaven, and it would seem, as if the very soul of Christ would want the external circumstances necessary for the continual use of a habit formed on earth. Her body as well as her soul had been an object of reverence to him, when Infant, Child, and Man in the flesh upon earth: the continuity of that reverence would have formed a deeply-rooted habit in his soul: and habits require external<sup>a</sup> circumstances suited to them.

<sup>a</sup> Butler, Anal. part i. chap. v. p. 115. "Without determining what will be the employment and happiness, the particular life of good men hereafter; there must be some determinate ca-



It would seem, then, a natural thing for Jesus to do, to secure the continuance of that habit he had voluntarily formed, by raising to heaven the object of it. Reverence may exist under such different circumstances, as to make it wear the appearance of love, rather than of submission. Still all habits create a sort of appetite for their object, and continue sometimes in a shape, which makes their identity scarcely recognisable, even when the object is changed. But it seems unnatural to suppose a person capable of securing the presence of their original object, and neglecting to do so. Hence also whatever be said against speaking of the habit of our Saviour's mind towards Mary as reverence *now*, it would seem that the habit, however modified by change of circumstances, must still subsist, and require its object in order to energize. We know that one of our senses, the sight, can act upon objects millions of miles off: it is therefore easy to believe, that the rest of them may acquire the same or greater powers in a glorified body; and therefore easy to believe, that while Mary was in existence upon earth, the habits in our Saviour's mind continued to find a scope, even though he was in heaven. But if his Mother's body, which he had so long regarded with filial veneration, was allowed to be completely disintegrated, it would seem as if those habits of veneration would be utterly without any scope for energy. But if happiness be an energy of the soul, according to the most excellent virtue<sup>b</sup>, and all virtue be a habit, and all habit requires a scope for energy, it would seem as if to deny the Assumption of the Mother

pacities, some necessary character and qualifications, without which persons cannot but be utterly incapable of it, &c."

<sup>b</sup> 'Ενέργεια ψυχῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἀρίστην, &c. this is Aristotle's well-known definition of virtue.

was opening a door to unhappiness in the soul of the Son. Neither does it seem fitting, that the Almighty power of Christ should wait so respectfully as it undeniably does upon the relics of ordinary Saints, unless it had also secured to his human nature a special scope for the veneration of his Mother's flesh. For it seems altogether natural, that as the justice of the eternal Trinity is wrought upon by the continual sight of the flesh which merited our Redemption, so the heart of Christ should be moved to pity by the present vision of those breasts, which he had condescended to suck while upon earth.

13. From what has been said, the careful reader will surmise, that any acts of veneration attributed to the glorified humanity of the Son, are called so not with a view to claim for him the power of still feeling fear, awe, or submission, which seem wholly precluded now that he is crowned with glory and honour: but with a view of expressing, not in the tongue of Angels, but of men, that astounding influence which Mary's prayers exert upon filial love. And it should seem, that the language of Scripture warrants our using such a mode of expressing it. For not only does Christ speak himself of waiting upon, or ministering to, his servants, (as above noticed,) but several times in the Apocalypse, as has been noticed already, calls the Trinity, 'My God.' This, it should appear, is done with a design to keep clearly before us, that he still has a nature capable of worshipping, although the manner of that worship is something infinitely above our present conceptions. Perhaps, therefore, it is not unjustifiable to say, that he who can speak of himself as waiting upon his Saints, may be spoken of by us as

still venerating the Queen of all Saints. But we shall consider this more fully in the last chapter.

14. In regard to this latter title of Mary, it may suffice to say a few words only. If we avail ourselves of St. Paul's question, we may reasonably say, to which of the angels said he at any time, 'Thou art my Mother, for thirty years I have obeyed thee?' He took not angels' nature, but the seed of Abraham, as he had spoken to our fathers. Once admit the Assumption, and the Coronation of Mary as Queen of Heaven will follow. She is described, according to some, in the Apocalypse, as clothed with the sun, and crowned with twelve stars: the heresy which paid her extravagant honours, treated her in a perverse way as Queen of Heaven, using probably some Catholic belief as a basework for offering her those sacrifices, which the heathen queen of heaven received. It is enough to have mentioned her Coronation for those who will meditate upon her Assumption: for those who will not, it is perhaps of little use to say more about her Coronation.

## CHAP. IX.

## UPON THE NATURE OF OUR BLESSED LADY'S INTERCESSION.

1. IN the foregoing chapter, the question, 'What amount of deference does Jesus pay to Mary now?' was treated in a manner which may be called evasive and unsatisfactory. For merely to give a private opinion, based upon a text of Scripture, which speaks of Christ *ministering* to his departed servants upon their entry into heaven, is in fact to evade the difficulty, and not to meet it. What a person out of the Church may be expected to be informed of, is this: when those in the Church make the power of Mary's prayers something different in kind, both from the Mediation of Christ, and the intercession<sup>a</sup> of common saints, in what does that difference lie? Is it possible to state clearly and in precise language, what sort of reverence Christ, in your theory, pays to Mary now? That you have the feeling, that there is a distinction between her intercession and that both of Christ and of the Saints, we are sure, as the use of a separate word, 'Hyperdulía,' for your reverence to Mary implies thus much. Still we suspect, that the distinction is a very vague and driftless one, and such

<sup>a</sup> Whether Hyperdulía differs from Dulía, as species from genus, or as genus from genus, is a controverted point. The protestant objector in the text may be supposed not to

be over-precise: possibly the question may be settled, by considering how the two stood related to each other in our Lord's mind. See below, §. 17.



as would easily let you go off into devotion extravagant (even upon your own theory) to Mary. All good Catholics would allow, that other saints may be asked to pray to her<sup>b</sup>: now if she cannot really command her Son, what does such an assertion mean? It is vain to tell me, that the mere words, 'Monstra te esse Matrem,' mean, 'shew yourself a Mother to *us*,' if you really all the while do plead guilty to the *thing* I object to, and Mary can command the Son. Either then state precisely what sort of power you give the Mother with the Son, or else I shall continue to hold you guilty of the impiety I have ever suspected you of.

2. This way of putting the matter, brings us to the question of which mention has been made already<sup>c</sup>: for as nobody but a madman would suppose Catholics made Christ worship his Mother with divine worship, or *Latría*, the whole question is, in what sense does he reverence her? is it with any sort of *Dulia*, or religious reverence, such as may be paid according to Catholics to saints or angels? Now in order to put the reader in a fair condition to judge of this matter, some preliminary steps must be taken. First, he must be reminded or informed of what the Church has sanctioned upon the subject: next, he must be made to see distinctly what sort of reverence our Lord paid to his Mother

<sup>b</sup> Speaking of the dignity of Mary's intercession, Suarez, in part iii. vol. 2. p. 211. says, 'Hinc ortum est ut inter alios sanctos non utamur uno ut intercessore ad alium, quia omnes sunt ejusdem ordinis: ad Virginem autem tanquam ad Reginam et Dominum alii adhibentur Sancti intercessores.' Such certainly is the *practice*

of those devout to Mary; but Lugo's *principles* (see below, §. 7.) would certainly lead one to think, that one Saint might be asked to speak to another, higher Saint, for us.

<sup>c</sup> Part i. chap. x. §. 3. and §. 19. part ii. chap. ix. §. 12. Let chap. xii. §. 16. and chap. xii. §. 20. be also remembered.

upon earth : and lastly, an attempt must be made to analyze and ascertain the limits of that power which all Catholics feel that Mary has with her Son now.

3. First: The Church has ever shewn the utmost jealousy about the Litany of Loretto: no one who uses it in public is allowed to alter it, without the express sanction of the Holy See. This appears from two considerations: from the general rule, that all prayers capable of gaining indulgences must be recited *exactly* as they are authorized by the Holy See, since the Indulgence otherwise cannot be gained; and from the particular fact, that most towns in Italy have some addition to it, for which addition they always are careful to get the authority of the Holy See. Hence a person who had a devotion to the Immaculate Conception, for instance, could not, by the authority of any individual Bishop, make the addition of the clause commemorating that mystery, without the sanction of the Pope: nor does it seem that he has a right to make deliberately any other addition whatever to this or any indulgenced prayer<sup>d</sup>. Now in this Litany, Mary is represented as Queen of Angels and of all Saints. Elsewhere, in the Breviary, she is styled Queen of Heaven. From this it is plain, that the Church practically adopts, and makes her own, the language of Martin the First above given<sup>e</sup>, so far as to consider Mary above all creatures whatever.

4. Moreover, that the Church does *not* intend this reverence to Mary to be given to her simply and solely because God was her Son, and with this in our minds while we are giving it, but also out of

<sup>d</sup> Cf. Theodor. de Sp. Sancto de S. Indulg. vol. i. p. 297. Amort Hist. Indulg. p. 483. q. 35. only make exceptions for small

omissions, &c. ex negligentia aut ignorantia aut impotentia.

<sup>e</sup> Chap. vii. §. 7.

a regard for the inherent sanctity of Mary herself, is plain from this: the proposition, 'The praise of Mary, as Mary, is vain,' is a condemned proposition<sup>f</sup>. Hence it is plain, that the Church regards Mary and the Saints as capable, in virtue of that sanctity which is inherent in them, of a reverence which terminates in themselves. When we reflect and reason and speculate, then of course we know that the ultimate source of all sanctity is Almighty God. In the same way, he is the source of all power; the reason why we are to obey the powers that be, is because they are ordained of God: but as it would be absurd to say, that there can be no civil obedience, which deserves the name of obedience, resulting from habit, unless it has this reason before it; so it would be absurd to say, that there can be no religious reverence, unless the ultimate reason of it is before the mind. To reverence authority as authority, without having to argue about it at all, is a proof of a highly finished habit of reverence in natural and visible things: to reverence what is holy as holy, instinctively and at once, and without goading one's self to it by eliciting reasons first, is a proof of a kindred habit in matters supernatural. The disbelief in inherent justice, and the adoption of that unreal system which makes God count just what is not just, and so makes God untruthful, is the real cause, of course, why protestants abhor the idea of reverencing holy beings as such at once, naturally, instinctively, and without eliciting reasons or requiring the mind to do the two operations of *Latria* and *Dulia* either at once or not at all. So great is the Church's sense of our inability to do the two well for long together, that she forbids

<sup>f</sup> See *Viva in Damn. Thes.* p. 481.

any picture or statue to be exposed, nay, orders them positively to be veiled<sup>g</sup>, when the most Holy Saviour is solemnly exposed for adoration in his sacrament. Mary then, or the Saints, may be regarded as capable in the Church's eye of having an act of reverence shewn to her or them, which terminates in her or them. Let this be particularly attended to, as the understanding of what will follow depends upon it, whether it be 'very shocking' or not: for even the Incarnation, when first presented to a pious heathen, would appear very shocking.

5. Next let us endeavour to see what sort of reverence it was, which our Lord paid his Mother upon earth. Now as he was what no one else ever was, at once a Traveller with us, and a Comprehender with the Angels, and that in his human nature, there is nothing to prevent his acts of *Dulia* being combined continuously with a reference to God, such as the imperfection of our own present state in part precludes. Therefore, even assuming that he did honour Mary with *Hyperdulia*, this, in him, was no doubt of a more perfect kind than in us. But that we may be able to see better, how far it was open to our Lord while upon earth to do acts of religious reverence to creatures, let the following passage from the great Cardinal Lugo be attended to. St. Alphonso has pronounced him to be decidedly the greatest theologian next to St. Thomas<sup>h</sup>, and therefore his state-

<sup>g</sup> See Gardellini, Comment. in Instruct. Clem. in Decret. Authent. S. R. C. vi. pt. 2. p. 14, 15.

<sup>h</sup> 'Post D. Thomam non temere inter alios theologos facile princeps Lugo dici potest, cum in dubiis discutiendis hic auctor sæpe nullo præeunte

falcem ita ad radicem ponit, ut rationes, quas ipse in medium adducit, difficulter solvi valeant. Theol. Mor. lib. iii. §. 552. It may be remarked for the information of some, that St. Alph. does not include Fathers, nor probably any before St. Thomas, among 'theologi.'



ment upon the matter may be looked upon as one of considerable consequence. After mentioning (in answer to some objections) the text that states that Christ was made a little lower than the Angels, he proceeds as follows :

6. " It seems then, that we should by all means assert, that Christ could as man perform an act of Dulia, and yield devotion even to other men and angels: and especially in regard to his most holy Mother and St. Joseph, there seems no doubt that he had devotion and veneration for them: for he was subject to them, not only by obeying them, but also by respecting them, yielding to them, and exercising all those acts of reverence which children are wont to exercise towards their parents<sup>i</sup>. Next, in regard to other men, especially the priests and ministers of the temple, princes and nobles, it seems certain that he practised similar acts of reverence and honour: for in no other way, in that civil and public life which Christ led, could he have escaped a great character for singularity and arrogance, if he had been the only person who did not shew the usual marks of reverence and honour. But these marks were not unreal and put on, but from a single mind, and were such as became the guilelessness of Christ. Consequently they rose from true internal submission, which was possible in Christ: for though he was absolutely and in himself far superior and more excellent than were all they, yet, by considering himself merely in his human nature apart from the other ornaments it had, he found himself inferior to others, considered as adorned with grace, or sanctity, or priesthood, or nobility and power, or, finally, with

<sup>i</sup> Compare the words of St. ' We worship the Martyrs, Austin given above, p. 154. &c.'

the title and dignity of Maternity: all which things carry along with them a certain superiority. On this ground then he could truly acknowledge others, considered as adorned with these titles, as superior to his humanity taken by itself; and from knowing this, was capable of submitting his humanity to those to whom he was inferior. Of this internal will and submission then, he could give marks not feigned, but true, by external reverence and respect. . . . In confirmation of this it may be observed, "that God cannot in any manner consider himself inferior to his creatures, or find any thing in himself which could be made submissive to any creature; and therefore cannot exercise an act of reverence or worship towards any one. But Christ *can* find in himself a nature which in itself really is inferior to the nature of Angels, or even to another humanity which is holy, or furnished with other ornaments; and this inferior nature he can rightly make submissive without any indecorum, just as by reason of that inferiority he was able to obey other men, though God cannot obey any one."

7. "There is an inference which may be made by the way here, and that is, that one Angel or Saint can 'à fortiori' reverence other Angels or Saints even though inferior, because he can recognise them as adorned with grace and sanctity, as superior to his own nature taken alone and by itself, and from knowing this can will the submission of his own nature to them, and hold it to be in an inferior rank to them: and of this internal will he could give proof by external reverence and worship as aforesaid. So even amongst men, *princes and prelates* exhibit frequently marks of honour and reverence to their own *subjects*, and to men who are their

inferiors, which signs we ought not to count offhand as put on and unreal, but as coming from true internal submission, such as may in the sense above explained be found even in the greatest princes<sup>i</sup>.”

8. Here then we have made a step in our investigation: the Church regards Mary as the Queen of Angels and Saints: one of its greatest divines states, that Christ could worship Angels, i. e. could pay that sort of religious reverence to them, which we pay to inferior beings. And much more could he, according to this great divine, pay reverence to his Mother. Whether or no Mary was while upon earth Queen of Angels, there may be some doubt, though it is not easy to see how, if all the Angels of God worshipped with divine worship her Only-begotten in her womb, they could fail to worship Mary with fitting worship, at the time when Christ's flesh and hers were one continuous unbroken substance. But it is not to Angels only, but to Saints, that Lugo gives the power of receiving worship from Christ, and that by virtue of the human nature which he has<sup>j</sup>. Why then, if he has this nature, can he not by virtue of it still receive his servants as they come to heaven with religious honour and respect? Not assuredly because he did not know when on earth that his human nature, as it existed in him, was better than any other human nature whatever, and has come now, like the Mopsuestene Christ, to know what then he did not know,—but, if at all, for some other reason than this.

9. It has been before observed, that the ideas of compulsion and fear, which we so readily mix with

<sup>i</sup> De Incarn. disp. xxxv. v. fully the whole passage there  
fin. given from him, p. 197. with

<sup>j</sup> See Cyril, quoted in vol. i. Lugo's doctrine.  
p. 204. n. q. and compare care-

that of obedience, could never have had any place in the obedience of Christ, which came always from a perfect love. Therefore if we refuse to him a capacity of *Dulcia* now, it must not be upon the ground that it implies compulsion and fear: otherwise, even when on earth, he could not have thanked an Angel for bringing him food in the desert, or strengthening him in his agony, or have done any act of *Dulcia*: for it is not reverential fear, but servile fear which love casts out. But in order to clear this question of embarrassment it ought to be observed, that the acts of *Dulcia* are of two sorts, one sort does and the other does not terminate in the creature, which is its object<sup>k</sup>. The latter, which does not terminate in the creature, Christ could not, in the sense here intended, have had: the former he certainly had. When I love a Saint, and rejoice in his name, or his picture, or in any thing that reminds me or others of him, I can do all this without thereby necessarily thinking at the same time of the Author of his sanctity. This is one phase of *Dulcia*: when I beg him to pray for forgiveness of my sins, I necessarily do think of his sanctity and Almighty God together. To ask him to pray to God, is to use his sanctity as a means of getting at God. Now I conceive it to be out of all reason to imagine, that Christ asked Mary, or Joseph, or Michael, or any other creature, to intercede for him: for this simple reason, that the idea of Christ being the only Mediator, from whom all inferior and created mediatorship has its rise, precludes the idea of himself asking others to intercede for him. Whereas there is nothing repugnant or contrary to

<sup>k</sup> This is the application of *de Laude Mariæ*, etc. what was said above, in §. 4.



his office as Mediator to conceive him as reverencing other beings in the days of his flesh, by all such other acts of Dulía above described, as do terminate in the creature. If Angels minister, it is to the heirs of salvation: but salvation is through Christ: therefore any mediatorial offices executed by them, seem dependent upon the foresight of Christ's merits; therefore it does not seem that Christ, the author of those offices in and by his own office as Mediator, could, without laying down that office, have asked others, even in his flesh, to pray for him. This therefore would not be one of the acts of Dulía he would have shewn his Mother even then. And this being so, that high and preeminent Mediatorship which belongs to Christ alone, is not only not interfered with by any power we ascribe to Mary, but absolutely thrown into a stronger light by it. We cannot imagine our Saviour saying the Litanies of the Blessed Virgin, but we can imagine him shewing every other kind of religious reverence to his Mother, in consideration of the sanctity inherent in her. It appears then distinctly, that there is something ordinarily included in Dulía, as practised by men, which must be excluded from Dulía as practised by our Lord even when upon earth.

10. The last question to be considered is, whether he carried this limited Dulía with him into Heaven; because, if he did, then his Mother might have, and be asked to exert, an influence with Jesus wholly different from what any other Saint has. If you speak of her 'commanding' her Son, it would be, even if Jesus does still pay her religious reverence, an objectionable expression, wherever people thought compulsion and fear necessary attendants upon obedience: it would however then militate rather against

the virtue of charity to our neighbour, than that of religion. And clearly it might be, on the supposition that he still pays her such reverence, a perfectly harmless expression, when used by persons of mind enough, or of faith enough, to eliminate from the idea of obeying a command, that fear or compulsion, which never belonged to obedience as practised by our Blessed Saviour: this *might* be the case, if they had no fellow-creatures more liable to be misled than themselves. However, it is against all religious philosophy to suppose, that the habits of reverence for Mary which Jesus had formed during his life upon earth had left no permanent impression upon his soul, and did not require external circumstances suited to this internal impression. The question therefore remains, is there any thing to prevent Christ from having a religious reverence for his Mother still, such as he had upon earth; from which reverence, fear and compulsion were excluded? What is it which Catholics hold or feel upon this subject?

11. Now I begin with saying, that to ask Mary to 'command' her Son, is not, so far as I know, a common way of speaking to her: possibly the mere form of speech was suggested by an Oriental<sup>1</sup> mode of expression; as when we say in the office Jube, Domne, benedicere, i. e. literally, 'Bid (God) bless us, sir.' This no more implies a strict command, than to 'bid' one farewell does. However, if ever used in any sense, it is used by reasonable intelligent creatures, such as Catholics *may* be, perhaps, even in the judgment of adversaries. There are, how-

<sup>1</sup> This was suggested to me some time back by Cardinal Wiseman, as a mode of explaining the 'Jube.' So too 'Solvi jubete' in the hymn for the Apostles.

ever, two feelings bearing upon the sense they would give to such an expression, existing, it is believed, in the mind of all Catholics who are earnest Catholics: one is, that Mary obtains whatever she asks; and the other is, that Christ's human nature is exalted to a royal dignity over the whole creation, such as it had indeed a right to from the first, but a right which it chose to waive, and so to pay tribute-money, and evince other marks of subjection when on earth. Now certain things may come in to qualify these two feelings. If Mary does obtain all she asks, then it may be said, 'to ask' is all one with 'to command;' and he who gives, is her subject. Follow this idea out alone and by itself, and without the qualification of other things which we believe, and it will make Mary the absolute and despotic mistress of the universe. But if we also believe, that God has given Mary a wisdom and insight into the divine counsels proportionate to her power, a wisdom in part acquired from her continual intercourse with Christ, in part infused either here or at her assumption<sup>m</sup>; then the former belief is qualified. And the same of course may be said of her love or charity. She cannot at once know God's counsels, love him as a Mother and as a creature, and yet act domineeringly with him, as an apostate angel would wish to have done. This then qualifies the first feeling I have spoken of: and I called them feelings, to express a belief that they were things habitually before devout Catholics, whether learned or unlearned.

12. In regard to the other feeling first spoken of, it is qualified by a knowledge of Christ's past conduct towards his Mother. Why should his present

<sup>m</sup> See the *Raccolta d' Indulgenze*, p. 9. ed. 1844. *Io vi adoro*, &c.

exaltation prevent ROYAL CONDESCENSION? The two are not contradictories. If owing to his divine nature he received the homage of all the angels of God to his whole Person when on earth, during which time he also at least occasionally paid reverence to them, why should not that same Person, by virtue of the human nature he still has, be capable of something analogous to homage to his Mother now? When he gives himself in the Holy Communion to the Saints, are we to suppose that he has in his human heart no feeling of religious reverence for them, no feeling different from what he has when he imparts himself to sinners? May not all those miraculous favours, which he shews at times to saints in the Eucharist, be looked upon not simply as displays of condescension in his divine nature, such as was shewn to Moses, but also as acts of a condescending reverence to those saints in his regalized human nature<sup>n</sup>? Human nature by itself is servile, and so capable of *Dulía*: but as it was in Christ, it was always royal, by virtue of its union with the Sovereign nature of the Godhead. It does not seem then that there is any reason which will prevent its royal condescension now, that would not also have prevented its using *Dulía* in the days of his flesh. I know not if this precise question, Does Christ pay *Dulía* to Mary now? has ever been treated by our divines: but the great Lugo's principles seem directly to lead to it. If Angels, who are not in the state of Travellers, but of Compre- henders, can by virtue of their nature, viewed in

<sup>n</sup> This might lead to a question, How far Christ could be said in Holy Communion to make himself, not only as

Lord, but also as a Worshipper, one with those who worship *him* there. Comp. n. k. vol. i. p. 195.

° See §. 7.



itself, reverence other holy beings, why should the King of kings and Lord of lords be incapable of shewing through his human nature, now no longer in the state of a Traveller, cognate acts of reverence ? especially when that reverence is supposed here to be shewn to a being raised high above all created natures but his own.

13. The reader will see, therefore, that I am reduced to the necessity of giving him nothing better than my own deductions upon the matter, from principles laid down by one of our greatest divines. It is false, utterly false, to suppose it is part of the Catholic way of viewing the present relation of Mary to her Son, to imagine that she can lord it over Almighty God as she likes. To state the matter so to unreflecting and unlearned protestants, is to be guilty of a flagrant and enormous lie. Nevertheless, our Lord, as being also Man still, may have a certain religious reverence for what his Mother likes, whether this is to be regarded as a species of *Dulía* or not. What she likes, is determined by a consummate wisdom bestowed by him upon Mary, first in order to govern himself in this life, and then in order to govern the universe in the next. But to go and tell an ignorant protestant that I, or any other Catholic, believed our Lord still capable of acts of religious reverence to his Mother, without at the same time telling him, that we believed her to be gifted by God with a prodigious and inconceivable degree of wisdom and of love, as the safeguards of this power with her Son, this is to use treachery, and bear down men by inexcusable deceit. What I honestly confess then is, that I am not able to see how *Dulía* or *Hyperdulía* is inconsistent with the glorified state of

our Lord's soul, provided this is not made to include asking the prayers of a Saint, or of our Lady: I am not able to see what sense can be put upon the words, 'transiens ministrabit eis,' so literal, so unallegorical, as the one which attributes to his human nature the present power of shewing reverence to his Saints.—'Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth. May the glory of the Lord be for ever! the Lord shall rejoice in his own works!'

14. This may be illustrated by what is said by several Catholic divines of the Angel refusing the homage of St. John in the Apocalypse. This is a favourite passage with protestants, and is supposed by them to shew incontestably, that it is wrong to adore created beings. Now it may be that the Angel saw that the adoration St. John intended was that of Latria—he may have known St. John's outward way of expressing this of a day to Christ at Mass, especially if he was St. John's Angel guardian—or spirits may know the thoughts more easily from other outward signs. But the way of meeting this difficulty here alluded to, is that which supposes that the Angel saw that St. John, even though still in the flesh, was higher and holier than he, or of greater dignity by virtue of his apostolic office<sup>p</sup>. Still it does not seem but what St. John would have had a right to shew to the same Angel every act of Dulia, which this command of his did not prohibit. The habit formed from doing so he might take to heaven with him, and, though he reigned there with Christ and shared his kingdom, might still shew certain acts of religious reverence towards the

<sup>p</sup> Vide Viva, l. c. p. 487. lib. ii. c. 9. §. 7.  
§. xvii. and Petav. de Angelis,

self-same Angel, though now unquestionably himself equal, at least, to the Angel. In the same manner, though Christ had ceased to be a little lower than the Angels, there does not seem to be any thing to prevent him in and by virtue of his human nature, shewing such acts of condescension to them as, with his divine nature, it was utterly and absolutely impossible for him to do. Much more then might he shew some sort of reverence, call it Hyperdulia, or what you may, to her whom he had raised to the highest dignity, and crowned as Queen of Heaven.

15. In confirmation of this view of the matter, it may be also observed, that there is the same difficulty about *Latria* that there is about *Dulia* in Christ. For *Latria* consists, as well as *Dulia*, of two parts, of sacrifice, and of all other such acts of adoration as are capable of being offered only to God, the object of sacrificial worship. Now when we speak of Christ's making intercession for us with the Father, (that is, with the Divine Nature common to all three Persons,) we speak of an act of *Latria*. So far as his body is a living Sacrifice for us, the Fathers<sup>a</sup> speak of it as ever-abiding and uninterrupted, though it be in the Mass that it is made of present efficacy to us. But as to other acts of intercession with God for us, divines<sup>r</sup> are not

<sup>a</sup> Athan. c. Arian. ii. 9. μέ-  
νουσιν ἀεὶ καὶ μὴ διατίπτουσιν,  
and Cyril, c. Nest. 74. e. Thes.  
p. 214. c.

<sup>r</sup> Qua ratione pro nobis  
etiamnum in Cœlo orare di-  
catur, non consentiunt inter se  
Theologi. Alii dicunt solâ hu-  
manitatis ac meritorum suorum  
representatione divinam pro  
salute nostrâ exorare clemen-

tiam: alii aiunt etiam expressâ  
oratione ac desiderio animæ  
suæ beatæ apertâ significatione:  
uterque autem orandi modus  
rectus et sanus est, et absque  
ullo purioris doctrinæ periculo  
defendi potest. Tournely de  
Incarn. p. 391. ed. Ven — Lugo  
de Inc. d. 27. § 4. de Euch.  
Sacr. d. 19. §. 7. Berti de  
Inc. p. 296. §. 16.

agreed, whether it be proper, considering Christ's present exaltation, to call them prayer or not. The act of his human will, through which he instituted the sacrifice of the Mass, is considered to be unbroken and continuous, and therefore to give the oblation of his body in heaven the form and nature of an unending sacrifice for us. But there seems to be no reason why the act of his will, by which he offers other acts of Intercession for us, should be thus unbroken and continuous: though probably our ideas of continuity are so defective here, as to prevent our forming any just conclusions in the matter!

16. Nevertheless, this difficulty, such as it is, seems to adhere (as in the case of *Dulía*) to our blessed Saviour's praying upon earth. Prayer (it might be said) is the raising of the soul to God: how can a soul, in hypostatic union with God, be said to be raised *to* God? *Dulía* again is the paying of religious reverence to a creature; how can a nature, which from its perfect union with God the Son is absolute Lord over the property, life, and reputation\* of his creatures, yet pay them religious reverence? There seems then to be a parallel difficulty in *Latría* and *Dulía*: the original exercise of them and the present, seem to be similarly related to each other, and to involve similar difficulties.

17. Against supposing our Saviour still able to pray for us, the difficulties do not arise so much from the mere doctrine of Scripture or the Church, as from the feeling of the faithful. If, it may be said, he can still pray for us, why can we not say, 'Jesus, pray for me?' And every one's first reply to such a

\* Let the reader recollect *prince* paying respect to his what Lugo says in §. 7. of a subjects.



question would in substance be, Because it is repugnant to the feelings and the practice of religious persons to ascribe *such* Latría to our Lord. And the same might be said of, 'Mary, command your Son.' Such language in any literal sense is absolutely *revolting* to any devout Catholic. Hence we see, that whatever becomes of the precise question, Does Christ venerate Mary with Dulía now? there exists in the Church a feeling corrective of any ascription of preposterous power to our Blessed Lady. That very sense of what is right, supposed by protestants to be corrupted or destroyed, is our light and guide, even in cases where it is excessively difficult to state precisely in theological phrase the exact scope and nature of that veneration, formed as a habit in the mind of our Lord whilst upon earth. If we try to look for some reason for this repugnancy in theology, not as in practice but in science, to give a solid one is not easy. Perhaps, however, it may be said, that at all times, in the days of his flesh as well as now, such acts of the human nature of Christ were acts of voluntary condescension upon the part of a divine Person. Hence we cannot conceive that the Blessed Virgin would ever have *asked* Jesus to pray for her, or do any such act of Latría to God for her. Such conduct would have implied an ignoring of his sovereign Mediatorship, and would be to forget in his human nature the divinity of his Person. Therefore if we make any reverence he pays to Mary now, whether we call it Dulía or by any other name, to be measured out entirely by a sovereign's condescension, we shall both explain the difference between Mary's power and that of any other Saints, and also secure to our Lord that freedom from subjection which Holy Writ ascribes to him after

his ascension. To no other Saint did he owe the kind of debt he had chosen to owe to her: well then may he choose to give her in heaven a different *kind* of honour, and expect us also to pay her a different kind of honour, that our days may be long in the land to which our Mother has gone before. He who measures out his veneration to her, determines the amount of it by what is fitting to his own position: and her desires are limited by the almost boundless wisdom he has given her. She is too good to let us go wrong in worshipping her: do what we may, we shall not pay her as perfect reverence as her Son paid her: we should be in no danger, if we could transplant into our own hearts the whole amount of that religious veneration, which was in the mind of Jesus when upon earth, for his Mother. And if we do reach heaven, we shall see then, what sort of veneration Jesus has for her, and think our own has been indeed worthless, and wholly inadequate to the transcendent dignity of the Mother of Jehovah in the flesh.

---

18. Let us now, in conclusion, review the course of thought which has been put before the reader in this work. We first considered what was implied in the idea of the Incarnation, and removed from Christ's human nature that brutelike ignorance which attends the commencement of our own being. We have considered what there was in Christian doctrine to elucidate, and what in heretical to thwart the fulness of grace and wisdom ascribed to Christ, and how in spite of this fulness he was capable of experimental knowledge and habits. In the Second Part, we have considered the influence of the Incarnation upon Mary, even supposing her, as the protestant version

leads people to suppose, to have been 'highly favoured' for the *first* time at the Incarnation. And we found that her opportunities for learning Christ's religion, and gaining grace and insight into his whole scheme of redemption, were inconceivably greater than any other creature ever enjoyed. In particular, the influence of thirty years in forming certain HABITS both in her and in her Son were considered. In the Third Part it has been attempted to shew, (to use a homely phrase,) how useful certain privileges attributed to her by Catholics would be, to fit her for her office as considered in the Second Part, and how consonant such privileges were, both to previous teaching of the Church, and to what God had done for her already; and also how much there is in heretical doctrine to thwart such privileges.

19. The reader is now desired again to take a fair review of the whole argument as an accountable being, and not as a clever disputant. The most veracious man may unintentionally make false statements, and yet no man treats him, as if he were therefore and thenceforward a liar. I have no doubt that there are in this book mistakes unknown to me, but discoverable by a clever disputant, and yet the whole argument, viewed fairly and as a whole, may be enough for all practical purposes. It may be quite sufficient to prove, that the Mother of our Redeemer cannot occupy any inconsiderable place in the creation, and that all objections raised against the Church for worshipping her are foolish and baseless to him, who feels that he has a soul to be saved, and cannot spare any thing whatever, that *may* be of help towards saving it. If I persuade him to love Mary, or persuade any to love her more, I entreat him to remember, that I too have a soul to save: I beg him to

commend me to her, to whose Queenly mercy is due whatever bright or ennobling thought my patron Saints have, whilst I have been engaged in this work, obtained from her for the unworthiest of all her clients.

FINIS.

QUOD DEUS IMPERIO, TU PRECE VIRGO POTES.



## INDEX.

---

### A.

- ABLE not, and not able to suffer, i. 282. 288. g. not, and not able to sin, difference of, 43.
- Adam probably informed that the state of his posterity depended on his own, ii. 375-6. as being in flesh and soul one person, transmits sin through his flesh, i. 57. capable of receiving a precept at first creation, 41. 289. his wisdom infused at once, 39-41. created in a supernatural condition, 37.
- Adorableness of Christ's flesh universally believed, i. 193. c. but wrongly by Nestorians, 193-4. and in such way as to make a Quaternity, 194. f. Cyril's teaching upon, a clue to his view of the state in which Christ's soul was created, 196-7. how far a consequence of the Incarnation, 201. not so far as Arian theories must make it, 202. but eternally belonged to the Second Person, 203. did not really increase at the Ascension, 210. though the occasion of adoring was greater, *ibid.*
- importance of ascertaining in the Nestorian controversy, 223.
- Advance in grace, &c. attributed to Christ's human nature, 151. but not as existing *in* him, *ibid.* co-ordinate with that in knowledge, 151-4. 157. St. Austin's doctrine on predestination of Christ confirmed by such attribution, 158. see *Christ*.
- Agnoetæ, sect of, opposed by St. Eulogius at St. Gregory's bidding, i. 250. obscurity of, *ibid.* Arian phase of, 251. tenet of Origen's similar to, *ibid.* is to Christ's intellect what Pelagians are to his will, 252. originated by a Theodosian, 255-7. but intrinsically Nestorian or Pelagian, 254-7. 277-8. discoverable in Theodore, 254. f. origin of, from the text of Mark xiii., 257.
- Albertus, M. saying of, quoted, i. 408. ii. 347.
- Allegorists partial to Mary, ii. 39. note.
- Allegory, love of, a help to devotion to Mary, ii. 147. f. argued from by the Fathers, *ibid.* chapter on, 190. 206. instances of some uniformly

- received, 206-7. adopted and so approved of by St. Paul, i. 366. ii. 207-10. whether Jewish in origin, 207-8. 210. adopted by the ablest Fathers, 208. Pagan, wherein unlike or like Christian, 209. looked on by Fathers as a universal solvent for difficulties, ii. 209. appears to have been *intended* by God that we should use it, 210. 214. 226. Bellarmine's opinion of its necessity, 211. l. only dangerous when used as Origen did to create new doctrine, 212. compared to a lock and key, i. 366. ii. 212. increases not faith but tangible evidence, ii. 212. force of, in confirming a dubious point illustrated, 213. adds to weight of evidence from miracles and visions, 214. See *Visions*. made up with these the original proof of Christianity, 215. its use as a probation to those who have not the faith, i. 366. Nyssen's remark on, 367. i. odious to the Nestorian party, 418. i. and to Theodorus, 81. q.
- Ambrose, his apparently diverging opinions on the created wisdom of Christ, i. 266. not really so, *ibid.* believed the Immunity, ii. 287. rule of, in interpreting Scripture, 302. n.
- Anatolius, difficulty he put before St. Gregory about Christ's soul, i. 284. fully stated, 285. answered at length, 286. &c.
- Andrew, St. epistle on his martyrdom, ii. 258. existed before the Council of Frankfurt, *ibid.* and probably was translated into Latin in the fourth century, ii. 259. furnishes at least a strong statement of the simile of the 'virgin earth,' 262.
- Angels, mortal, in what sense, i. 262. u. ii. 229. j. 252. fall of, in Mopsuestene's theory, 337. b. proves all creatures capable of a fall, i. 162. have a knowledge of God altogether unerring, 199. 206. and the beatific vision, 210. 262. may know the day of judgment, 261. s. are represented as ignorant to teach us, 206. u. 209. yet see not futurity, 210. i. and so may act against God's will from ignorance, ii. 294. 353. see not man's heart, i. 209. as not penetrating his soul, ii. 63. but can draw conclusions from his tenets he does not see, i. 11. saw still less Christ's heart, and so gained knowledge at the Ascension, 211-12. experimental knowledge in, 209. f. 210. 211. said to be taught to adore God in the flesh, 203. 216. 364. why said to adore him at the Nativity rather than the Conception, 208. might be thanked by Christ at his agony, ii. 387. (cf. 112.) why sent to Joseph, not to Mary, 14. feelings of, in the house of Loretto imagined, 33-4. and union with a human nature, as illustration, i. 246-7. may worship other angels, ii. 412. why one of, refused John's worship, 420. Christ Lord of, even in the flesh, i. 360. carnally represented as playing on harps, &c. 359.
- Anglicans, their Pelagian tendencies examined, i. 91-110. theory of, ii. 132.

- Anianus, the Pelagian, translated some of Chrysostom, ii. 179. h.
- Anna, prophecy of, ii. 12.
- Anne, St. not immaculate because Mary was, ii. 305. not our Lord's grandmother, *ibid.*
- Annunciation, words of, i. 349-50. made Christ at once Mary's dutiful Son, 351. 354. see *Christ, Mary*.
- Antony, St. his rules about visions, ii. 194. makes Mary's visit to Elizabeth a sample of a good influence, 195.
- Apocalypse, why parts of seem to favour Nestorianism, i. 219.
- Apollinarianism, Cyril accused of, i. 229. rudeness of early forms of, ii. 317. makes man three substances, 318. is Manichean, 316-18. Eutychianism a scion of, i. 170. ii. 318. quaternity of, i. 194. h. how connected with Arianism, ii. 355. r.
- Apollinaris, seems to deny the possibility of infused habits, i. 159. 231. 318. q. gives Christ a brute soul, i. 167. b. ii. 318. 338. f. and a phantastic flesh, i. 170. ii. 318.
- Apollinarists, affected orthodoxy on the Trinity, ii. 355. q.
- Appearance of Christ to Mary first after the Resurrection, ii. 106, &c. seemingly denied by St. Mark, 108. senses his words may bear, 109. omitted in many Mss. 109. e. Mr. Greswell's order of, differs from St. Ignatius's, *ibid.* professional appearances distinguished from others, ii. 111. 115. to angels at the Resurrection, 111. recorded ones relate to the doubting, not to the believing, 113. no early one to St. John recorded, 114. nor to St. Joseph of Arimathea, or Nicodemus, 114-15. did not occupy the whole forty days, 115-18.
- Arian, remarkable passage from an early, ii. 364.
- Arians, argue from Christ's worshipping, and seeming ignorance to his inferiority, i. 196-7. Cyril's comments upon, 197-8. make Christ soul-less, 154. ii. 355. r. and sometimes incapable of progression, i. 155. maintain Mary needed purification, ii. 3. d.
- Arianism, three forms of, ii. 321. the extreme form has most Manichean tendencies, 322. disliked denying the Son was very God, 322. h. 356. u. its relation to Sabellianism, 326. interprets Scripture so as to favour Manicheism, 325. how opposed to the Immunity, 355-9.
- Aristotle thought the soul came into being after the body, i. 369. b. quoted on lust, 99. k. 101. t. on the Egyptian priests, 153. k. on happiness, ii. 403. b. on habits, i. 319. r.
- Assumption, why odious to the Manichees, ii. 341. see *Mary*.
- Attributes, divine, first clearly treated of by Anti-Arian writers, i. 148. human, by Anti-Pelagian, and Anti-Monothelite, ii. 365, &c. of God, are himself, i. 260.
- Augustine, his doctrine of grace seemed a novelty, i. 130. g. Cardinal Noris's opinion of Vincent of Lerins' work as against him, 131. not followed as doctor of grace in the East, *ibid.* his difficulties in proving the antiquity of his doctrine, *ibid.*

ii. 266. accused of destroying freewill by predestination, 289. does not seem to give a theory to explain their agreement, *ibid.* i. 122. s. confutes Nestorianism, i. 68. his prayer for his friend's conversion, 104. St. Monica's prayers for, 105. and to, ii. 121. makes all heresies deny the Incarnation, 167. his reasons for bearing with the heretics he had left, 3. his address to St. John, 17. silence of, where he might have degraded Mary, if conceived in sin, ii. 137. 276. his shrewdness in avoiding irrelevant controversies, 277-8. exempts Mary from all actual sin, 278-9. will not entertain the question of sin in her, 279-80. affirms that all but Mary would deceive themselves, if they said they had no sin, 280. flatly denies that he transcribes Mary to the Devil, 285. his opinion, that ignorance excused sin, never retracted, i. 41. m. see *Cyril*.

## B.

Bacon quoted, ii. 97. k.  
 Baius, denied Mary's Immunity, ii. 264. a. 340. m.  
 Basil, St. prayer of, quoted, i. 104.  
 Beast, the, in Apocalypse blasphemes Mary, ii. 56.  
 Beatitudes, are fulfilled in Mary, ii. 57.  
 Become, to, in what sense used of Christ, i. 61.  
 Benedict XIV. his letter on Cardinal Noris's works, i. 129. error condemned by, on the Eucharist, 390. t.  
 Benevolence, Unitarians make God all, ii. 321.

Bernard, St. thwarted the Immunity, ii. 268. 312.  
 Besaleel, had an infused habit of art, i. 318.  
 Blasphemy of Divine, worse than of human, nature in Christ, i. 265. z. a. ii. 66.  
 'Blessed,' meaning of when applied to Mary, i. 397. ii. 236. controversial use of when so applied, ii. 144. is Mary's name in the Rubrics, *ibid.*  
 Blood, of Christ, hypostatically united to him in his Passion, ii. 61. on Mary's clothes, 104. first worship of, 79. 104.  
 Body, theory of its pre-existence, i. 368. b. c. ii. 250. d. essential to man's nature, ii. 376. b.  
 Bonaventure, Life of Christ attributed to, styled a pack of nonsense, i. 411. a.  
 'Born of women,' used of those born in sin in Scripture, ii. 239. x. (see *Addenda*.)  
 Brahmin, how Christianity would appear to a, who studied it, i. 29. phase of adopted by, ii. 329.

Brute, result of imaginary union of, with human nature, i. 246.  
 Bull, believed the Ever-Virginity, i. 361. a.  
 Burning bush, Mary compared to in her pregnancy, i. 365. g.  
 Butler, his doctrine of habits, i. 306. 320. ii. 32. l. 37. 402. on the opinion of necessity, i. 119. on the idea of mediators, 396. h. ii. 178. d.

## C.

Caietan quoted, i. 121. q.  
 Calls to be obeyed in spite of parents, ii. 43.



- Calvinism leads to Manicheism, i. 125. y. ii. 340. m.
- Cana, feast of, ii. 37. see *Mary*.
- Cannibalism, Nestorianism leads to, i. 102. 193. a.
- Canonization, process of, ii. 126.
- Cassian, John, employed by Leo to write against Nestorianism, i. 420.
- Celestius, the Pelagian, principally denies original sin, i. 56.
- Celibacy, abandoned by Nestorianizing Christians, i. 93-101. such abandonment of, only defensible on Pelagian principles, 94. and not on Augustinian, 95.
- Chalcedon, Council of, called Cyrillian by a Nestorian writer, i. 169.
- Chaldees, did not deny the Double Procession in formulas, i. 72. e.
- Charity, makes willing to hear defence of veneration for Mary, i. 1-3.
- CHRIST, styled the foolishness of God, i. 354, note. human nature of, mentally severable from the divine, 43. 158. 273. 277. ii. 252. yet really one with God from the first, i. 44. 171. 228. 230. ii. 250. indirect proof of this belief, i. 231. 382. 384. ii. 240. 260. passages from Petavius on, i. 231. 338. from the Fifth General Council, 232. why not always stated as strongly by Cyril as might be expected, 223. 334. q. taken by, as originally created, 45. 289. always had the Spirit, 163. and so was a source of merit in others, 144. 158. 182-3. 336. 392. ii. 302-3. and incapable of advance in grace, &c. i. 48. 52. 227. (see *Advance*.) as might be assumed, if we knew God had taken man's nature, 282. hypostatic union of, contrasted with that of Mary, ii. 346. g. or the Saints, i. 47-51. EFFECTS of this union, (A) on the
- FLESH of, i. 45. 193, &c. why not created like Adam's from the earth, i. 40. ii. 274. 341. exempted from lust, i. 44. 99. m. which however Pelagians blasphemously give it, 44. 100. 286. d. ii. 339. how far corruptible, i. 286. e. &c. made phantastic by Apollinarians, 170. ii. 318. 355. s. Eutychians, i. 167, &c. ii. 320. 348-50. and Manicheans, 315. 340. state of, the main subject in controversy with Nestorius, i. 223, &c. 167-8. as on this depended its capacity of sacrifice from the first, *ibid.* 63. 223. and for filling Mary as God with grace, 363. and being transfigured at will, 217-18. 422-4. passive adoration of, 193. (see *Adorableness*.) active adoration in, 197-9. 204. q. 219. 330. ii. 411-18. (see *Angels*, *Dulia*, *Latria*, *Mary*.) Christ below the Angels in, i. 270. scars in remain, 320. (B) on the
- BLOOD of, i. 287. ii. 61. origin of worship of, ii. 79. 104. not shed with the same intention, as on the Cross, at the Circumcision, i. 287. (C) on the communion with, 108.
- SOUL of, in making it greater than aught created, i. 269. and giving it INFUSED KNOWLEDGE, 34. 52. 221-249. which includes a knowledge of men's hearts, 235. 291. Satan's thoughts, 242. ii. 364. f. the extent of Angelic knowledge, i. 242. 258. 262. 283.

future events, 242-5. 291-3. ii. 364. f. of the traitor, i. 235. the time and manner of the doom, 243-5. of the worship of Mary by millions, 279. and contempt of by protestants, ii. 56. increased his sorrows, i. 291. and agony, ii. 56. enabled him authoritatively to dispense with Moses' laws, i. 212. 245. 293. as being conscious from the first, 236. of God's will, 236. 239-41. and as having the Spirit, 163. 298-300 made him alone understand his own Incarnation, 269. gave him the Beatific Vision, 299. 295. 338. and made him at once Viator and Comprehensor, 334. p. ii. 387. 410. explains why he is never said to remember reason, or believe, i. 245. and how he was capable of a command at the first from Mary, 353. is not gainsaid by the dereliction on the Cross, 294. or by the apparent

— IGNORANCE, ascribed to, i. 197. 223. 293, &c. which was *from*, not *in*, his human nature, 46. 277. and was put on by an economy, 226. 297. 300. was proportioned to the growth of his Body, 226. which yet is no fair index of the interior state of his soul, 221. 287. and certainly was not human ignorance, 290. (see *Anatolius*.) nor in one sense allowed even by schoolmen to be real, 313. h. 337. yet is best explained by their doctrine of

— EXPERIMENTAL KNOWLEDGE in, i. 302-337. ii. 7. i. 51. c. which, though scarce known to the Fathers, i. 303-4. ex-

plains the effect of sleep on Christ's senses, 302. 312. 338. and his acquired habits of compassion, 305. &c. and throws a light in general on acquired (see *Experimental knowledge*.)

— HABITS in, as Viator, i. 305-7. 321. of compassion, 305. 315. 319-21. ii. 36. of art, i. 313-14. 319. of particular affections, 316. ii. 19. 32-3. 38. 388. 403. 409. of reverence to Mary, i. 195. 319-20. 338. ii. 32. 36-40. 45-50. 51. 90. 117. 291-5. permanency of such habits in, i. 316. 321. ii. 47. 388. 403. 415. seems impaired from change of circumstances, i. 317-18. subjection to law of, explains the delay at Nazareth, ii. 43. 90. (D) on the

— HUMAN WILL of, i. 69. ii. 369. which, and not the divine, was subject to Mary, i. 392. ii. 32. 354. subjection of, to God proves that to Mary, i. 204. to Mary, 351. 391. x. ii. 32. 36. 40. 51. not from fear, ii. 117. 413. genuine, 411-12. not under compulsion to suffer, i. 288. g. 326. f. 327. ii. 77. physically capable of determining itself otherwise, i. 358. v. state of correlative to that of his flesh, ii. 382. had not another opposing will, 364. 371. 380. (see *Pelagians*, *Monothelites*.) human operations only by, 332. and not as the miracles by the whole Trinity, i. 114. d. ii. 332.

Chrysostom, genuine works of, do not *shew* devotion to Mary, ii. 39. o. 133. 178. strange passages from, 133. has difficulties on grace also, ii. 179. the Benedictine edition not to be depended on, ib. h.

- Church, no demonstration of being of, i. 13. e. the, different arguments for, ii. 221. consistency of her doctrine may be one, 222.
- Cicero, passage from, on habits remaining hereafter, i. 317. on gratitude, ii. 19. his influence on Augustine, *ibid.* z.
- Classics, influence of the study of, on after life, i. 318.
- Collyridians, their heresy checked by a godly bishop, ii. 153.
- 'Commemorantes,' the prayer in the Mass, St. Austin's statement on, ii. 186.
- Communion of infants, real meaning of, i. 108. argument from, against Pelagianism, 109.
- Communion, effect of holy, i. 58. ii. 103.
- Concupiscence not from God, i. 96. c. 98. i.
- Confession abandoned by Nestorianizing Christians, i. 93. a.
- Consistency, ii. 384. the argument here given from, stated concisely, 215. of Catholic doctrine, i. 25. visible to those without, ii. 220, &c. not alone a proof of truth, i. 25. yet thought of weight even by misbelievers, 26. illustrated from the genius of a language, 27. from the law, 150. from prophecy, 33. partial evidence in its favour, 13. results either from divine inspiration, or from its being all known in earliest ages, 29, 30. is of organic growth, 30. Gelasius' testimony to, 31. philosophical, *ibid.* r. and heretical doctrines, 32. v. deficient in this proof, 32-3. which puts protestants under an obligation to attend to the Church, 33.
- Conversion, praying for, implies belief that God is the author of grace, i. 103. prayer by others precedes it, 104.
- Conversions, sudden, often not really so, ii. 24.
- Corban, note on, ii. 304.
- Corrupticolæ, i. 255, 257.
- Course of nature, fallacy of arguing from, against that of grace, i. 370.
- 'Creature,' why not used of Christ, i. 15.
- Creatures, their attributes severable from their substance, i. 36.
- Crucifixion, reflections on Mary's connection with, ii. 69, &c. two meanings of, 69, 70. in the active sense, done on the ground, 71. d. our Lord's hands drilled for, 71. See *John, Mary*.
- Cyril, his vigilance, i. 162. z. his Thesaurus written before the Commentary on St. John, 162. a. presided at Ephesus, 87. 166. ii. 192. and signed before the Legates, 87. had the honour of enthroning Mary in the title Mother of God, 167 his services attested by a Nestorian writer, 169. by the Codex Encyclicus, 171. opposed Origen's theory of preexistence, 173. 186. said to say little about original sin, 173. but wrongly, 174. afraid of Celestianism in his own flock, 173. passages from, on original sin, 63. 174. on man's helplessness, 175. on the divine origin of faith, 177. on the need of grace to continue in well-being, 65. 179-81. on the impossibility of merit without a divine source of it, 181-4. heresies of Egypt of a kind to keep him from



speaking openly on predestination, 185. which however he sometimes does, 188. dissertations against preexistence of souls in Com. on St. John, 186. his use of the terms 'Image' and 'Quality' of the Holy Ghost, 189. helps us to guess his opinion on predestination, 190. passages in proof of this, 191. why not explicit about the state of Christ's soul, 223. save when driven by controversy to it, 224. 229. says he has nothing to do with Apollinarianism, 229. yet afterwards wrote against it, *ibid.* 318. u. denies the union made the body unchangeable, 229. but asserts it of the soul, 153. 230. acuteness of, in eluding questions not immediately relating to his work, 230. his doctrine on Christ's soul paves the way for the present, *ibid.* his work was to preach the hypostatic union, 146. &c. comparison between him and St. Austin, 147. Petavius' character of this writer, 149. was apostle of the union, 146. 159, &c. and so ascribes to Christ no intrinsic advance, 156. speaks of Christ, *as if* he had a divine wisdom only, 158. 163. his influence at Chalcedon, 161. makes Mary scandalized at the Cross, ii. 138. d. does not say worse of Mary than St. Paul of Christ, *ibid.* his clear statement on Latria and Dulia, ii. 183.

## D.

Dalmatius, St. the Council of Ephesus's opinion of his gift of vision, ii. 192.

Debbora praises Mary in Jahel, ii. 237.

Developments, i. 27—30. how they appear to those without, ii. 220, 222.

Devils cannot imitate birth of a Virgin, ii. 300. l.

Dimas, St. the penitent thief, ii. 75. Mary's gratitude to, *ibid.*

Dionysius, the pretended Areopagite, ii. 136-181. r. gives Mary no place in his Hierarchy, 136-181. 397. a Euty-chian, 180. i.

Dionysius of Alexandria, thwarted the reception of the Apocalypse, 312. suspected by Basil of Arianism, 329.

Discrimination, in the Indian Pantheism, ii. 326. q.

Dives, habits of natural affection remain in, in hell, i. 316. j. 317.

Doctrine, historical treatment of, involved in difficulties, ii. 247. disclosed by degrees to the world without, 365-6. poured out as prophecy, i. 33. ii. 363. 382. not seen in Scripture, but by those who hold it, 146.

Dominic, St. his belief, in a miraculous book, of the Immunity, ii. 257.

Dominicans, bound by oath to maintain St. Thomas's doctrine, ii. 249. a. and yet maintain the Immunity, *ibid.* have been the champions of grace, 290.

Dominus tecum, the singular of Dominus vobiscum, i. 347-8. g. a higher meaning put on it by St. Peter of Alexandria, ii. 236. and by two Councils, *ibid.*

Doubt in Mary, explained by doubt in Jesus, ii. 65. c. f. 182.



Dulia, may terminate in the creature, ii. 409. but does not in all its acts, 414. passage from Lugo on it in Christ, 411. who never could have used such as does not terminate in the creature, 415. difficulties of, the same as those about Latria in Christ, 421-2. passage of St. Austin upon, 153-5. and of St. Cyril, ii. 183. Christ capable of, i. 195. 220. even after the Resurrection, ii. 122. 338. 409. implies a raising of the mind to something invisible, i. 195. ii. 422. perfect in Christ, *ibid.* consideration of, in Christ connected with that of infused and experimental knowledge, i. 339.

## E.

Earth, virgin, ii. 254. 259-262. &c. See *Immaculate Conception*, under *Mary*.

Earnestness, as to the rightness of, wrongness of, worshipping Mary, test of, ii. 129.

Economy, distinguished from theology, i. 280-1. principle of, 273, 274. senses of, 280. practised by Christ, 297.

Effect, in architecture, Butler's illustration from, applied to the Immunity, ii. 265.

Egypt, visit to, reflections on, ii. 11. idols of, &c. 14. p. destroyed by Christ's visit to, ii. 16-18. saints and doctors of, sprung from it, 18.

Elias, Nyssen's remark on, i. 367. is to die at last, ii. 297. though he has his body now, 395.

Elizabeth, her son given through prayer, i. 401. Mary's visitation to, i. 368. &c. knew Mary's dignity by inspiration, 376. through her son, 377.

Emerich, sister, visions of, ii. 15. quoted, 65. e.

'Emmanuel,' safeguard against Nestorianism, i. 63.

Enoch, see *Elias*.

Ephesus, Council, an unwieldy body, if it had not been headed by Cyril, i. 166.

Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasses, carried the relics of Jacob, ii. 185.

Ephrem, St. speech put by into Mary's mouth at the Nativity, i. 428. no Benedictine edition of, ii. 133. 170. q. makes the penitent thief a convert of Mary's, ii. 168. 75.

Epiphanius, opposed the Collyridians, ii. 153. compared in this to Benedict the XIVth, 155.

Essences, not intelligible by us, ii. 324. m.

Esther, i. 348. exempted from a sweeping law, ii. 228, 299.

Eternity, imperfectly expressed by notions drawn from time, i. 114-15. ii. 296.

Eucharist tells against Pelagianism as source of grace, i. 59. a redemptive food, ii. 170. kept a secret from the unbaptized, 159. Satan afraid of its power in Judas, 103. would have reclaimed him had he waited awhile, *ibid.*

Eulogius, his prayer for England, ii. 18. his treatment of the heresy of Agnoetæ, i. 270-2. Gregory's commendation of, 277.

Eunomianism, or Ultra-Arianism, in what it lies, ii. 323-4. its Manichean tendencies, *ibid.*

Eusebius of Cesarea heretical, ii. 356. v. passage from, of orthodox sound, but heretical sense, 357. (Ep. i. 231.) Pseudo-Basil on Isaias taken from, 358. y.

Eutychianism leads to heresy on the Trinity, more than Nestorianism does, i. 251. related to Manicheism, ii. 320. *inclines* to Apollinarianism, 348. Leo's description of it, *ibid.* as undoubtedly Manichean, *ibid.* it entirely destroys the Prototype after which Mary was formed, 349. lustfulness of its followers, 314. c. 350. l.

Eutychian controversy did not lead to express statement about the state of Christ's soul, i. 168.

Evasive answers when allowable, i. 264. 275.

Eve and Mary, ii. 301. contrast of, ii. 168, &c. 174. was the vision before the Church's mind from the first, ii. 270.

Evidence uncertain prior to faith, ii. 191. weak, not no evidence, i. 13. ii. 267. less given to those who by sin have forfeited the greater, i. 415.

Evil cannot come from good, sense of, ii. 336.

Exemptions from the law of sin, ii. 297. 300. all expect in their own case, 299.

Exorcisms, Augustine's argument from, in favour of original sin, i. 106-8. dropped by Nestorianizing Christians, 106.

Experimental knowledge in Christ, i. 302. scarce mentioned by the Fathers, 303-4. &c. but implicitly for most part, 337. why not discussed by them, 304. importance of

discussing it, 305. 338. habits cannot be formed without, 306. illustration of, from mathematics, 308. from memory, 309. from heathen theory of natural and acquired virtue, 309-10. from the present state of Saints in heaven, and their future one, 311. maintained by schoolmen from texts used by Nestorians to disprove infused knowledge, 326. 336. See *Christ, Habits.*

## F.

Faculties, suspensions not their destruction, ii. 21.

Faith in the heart before in creeds, i. 27. illustration from language, *ibid.* has relation to opinions as well as dogmas, i. 13. ii. 289. the gift of God, i. 177-9. was not in Christ, 245.

Fatalism leaves free-will where it was, i. 119. see *Predestination.*

Fathers, difficulties of ascertaining the meaning of, in certain cases, ii. 247. sense of to be learnt from general tenor of their works, i. 210. g. wrong, morally and intellectually, to go by isolated passages of, ii. 176. when their whole bias is the other way, 177. write with reference to circumstances of the day, 153.

Felix of Urgela, his Agnoetic bias, i. 257.

First-born, use of distinction between, and Only-begotten, i. 192. 201. 203. 207. ii. 69. Arian assertion about, 192. of Mary, meaning of, i. 362. 363.

Flesh of sin, ii. 251. conceivable better by aid of the fiction of its preexistence to the soul, *ibid.* how Mary's flesh was said to be, 251. z. See *Christ, Mary.*

Frankfurt, Council of, statement of the Immunity, ii. 254. natural development from the Monothelite controversy, 384-5.

Free-will, Jesuits defenders of, ii. 290. use of, in forming habits, 291. 295.

## G.

Gabriel, his message why doubted of by Mary, ii. 169. his words put at their lowest meaning, i. 346. at their highest, ii. 235. contain a quotation from Judges, 236. was one of the seven spirits, i. 364. f.

Gamaliel, ii. 25.

Garnier gives up the early Fathers to the Agnoetæ, i. 267. d.

Gelasius Cyzicenus, Cave's opinion of him, i. 269. g. quoted, *ibid.* ii. 181.

Genealogy, remarks on the five women mentioned in, ii. 243-5.

'Gethsemane,' meaning of, ii. 80. k.

God, infidel argument that he cannot undo what is done, i. 354. alone pervades other spirits, 247. ii. 45. to win, not to force them, *ibid.* creates nothing contrary to himself, i. 99. l. uses nature even when introducing miracles, ii. 160. cannot will means to men's damnation, i. 124. does not receive his goodness, but is it, 164. has

no past and future, i. 116-17. ii. 296.

Good woman, difference of Catholic and protestant idea of, i. 346. 348.

Good, two meanings of, ii. 336. Gospel, St. John's, the prince of all, ii. 89.

Grace, none capable of making Christ's flesh one with God but that of the hypostatic union, i. 61, 62. Cyril and Augustine use it in two senses of Christ, 145. Christ the heart which circulates it, 58. creates goodness, is not given at first on account of it, ii. 8. 11. and free-will, three theories to reconcile, i. 129. all Catholic doctors believe in both, *ibid.* St. Austin's doctrine of, as hard to prove from antiquity as Mary's Immunity, ii. 267. need of, to recover man, (from St. Cyril,) i. 176. result of creative power, 182. the Church proclaims the need of, 54. her prayers proof of belief in, 103, &c. will account for any change, 3.

Gratitude, passage from Cicero upon, ii. 19.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, revelation to, i. 400. ii. 194. 394.

Gregory the Great ascribes conversion of England to Eulogius's prayers, i. 250.

Greswell, Mr. in a work printed at the University Press, denies the Ever-Virginity, ii. 156.

## H.

Habits, Butler's theory of, i. 306. applied to Christ, 306. 317. 318. 320. 322. distinguished from infused 'habits,' 306. puzzle of the heathen as

- to origin of, 310. of art, 313. of natural affection in Dives, 316. j. left in the damned without sphere of operation, 317. l. theory of, explains Mary's endurance at the Crucifixion, ii. 74. and Christ's idling at Nazareth, 43. 90. 118. of compassion in Christ, i. 319, &c. ii. 36. theory of, from Cicero, i. 317. Plato, 31, &c. 53, &c. ii. 37. Mary subject to law of, 23. 290-3.
- Haman, a type of Satan, ii. 299.
- Heathens, God a refined matter with, ii. 315. l. see *Habits*.
- Hebrew text, used as the measure of the Latin's meaning, i. 411. b.
- Helen, illustration from story of, ii. 360.
- Heresies, crude at first, but afterwards systematized, ii. 317. doctrine of devils, 309. 333. o. 339. shifting nature of, 309. extreme, Catholic truths mean betwixt, 310. not misrepresented because incoherent, 312. all tend to Manicheism, 313, 316. have an antiquity of their own, 362. Satan allowed by God to develop them in a certain methodical order, 363-6. knowledge of the opposite, necessary to understand them, i. 154. seemingly opposed to each other, but really only to the truth, 166. unity of principle in those seemingly opposed, 166. ii. 329. have relation to country's bias antecedently to conversion, i. 178. m. 185.
- Heretics, measure state of Christ's soul by body, i. 257. cunning of, 80. excuse for summoning them from their place, ii. 311. St. Ambrose represents them as coming to be judged, *ibid*.
- Heyne, critical rule from, i. 51. e.
- Homer does not disparage Helen himself, ii. 360.
- Honorius, denied a corrupt will in Christ, ii. 368. 379. use of his seeming fall, 370, &c. 378. denied an opposition of wills in Christ, 381.
- Hope, how in Christ, i. 237.
- Human acts caused by human will, i. 119.
- Human nature existed not the twinkling of an eye before the union, i. 171. see *Christ*.
- Hypatius disputed the genuineness and orthodoxy of the Areopagite, ii. 181.
- Hyperdulia a controverted point, if it differs in kind from Dulia, ii. 406. d. 424.
- Hypostatic union, safeguard against human merit, i. 336. caused merits, not merits that union, 144. see *Christ*.

## I.

- Idolatry, supposed danger of, i. 9. how obviated, 10. 15. see *Latria*.
- Idols of Egypt, ii. 16, 17. p.
- Ignatius, St. on predestination, i. 123. quotation from, on Christ's appearance after the Resurrection to Mary first, 107, &c.
- Ignorance of babes, a result of the fall, i. 39. 42. passage from St. Austin upon, *ibid*. not in Christ, 46. removable by a union less than the hypostatic, 47-8. ascribed to Christ from Mark, (xiii. 56.) 257. Arian view of the text, 258. climax in, fatal to Agnoetæ, 258. 262. see *Christ*.



- not to be judged of by state of his body, i. 221. see *Christ*.
- Ignorantists, i. 250. see *Agnoetæ*.
- Image and likeness, possibility of distinction in, ii. 302. n. of God in man, not so as in Angels, 375. a. once applied to the Holy Ghost, i. 189. first by whom, *ibid.* b. see *God*.
- Imagination, scope given to, by the Incarnation, i. 425. active on evil if not on good, *ibid.* a. ii. 33. 52. 63.
- Immaculate, pregnant sense of the word, ii. 256.
- Incarnation, not easy to understand the doctrine of, i. 19. appears inconsistent and irrational, 20. but is not so when once received by faith, 21. 23. transcends all illustrations, 21. is illustrated however by other mysteries, 22-3. doctrine of, intimately connected with that of grace, 53. influence of controversies on, in promoting Mary's glory, ii. 365, &c. held by some to precede in God's mind the existence of sin, i. 394. note. ii. 302. n. paves the way for veneration to Mary, i. 30. reasoning on, why more perplexing than on the Trinity, 281. effects of, dependent on God's will, 283. absurd to heathen, 354. ii. 410. no lively faith in, out of the Church, ii. 11. Catholic, not other doctrine of, consistent with worship of Mary, i. 12. 14.
- Infants, ignorance of, from sin, i. 40-1.
- Intellect put under trial by revelation of doctrine, i. 11. 145.
- Intelligence, meaning of, ii. 26.
- Invocation of Saints does not contradict reason, i. 24. see *Dulia*.
- Isaac born through concupiscence, ii. 237. t. his conduct at Abimelech's, i. 362.

## J.

- Jacobites retained old liturgies, ii. 187.
- Jahel, i. 348. ii. 236.
- Jansenism leads through Calvinism to Manicheism, ii. 340. its aversion to inherent justice, i. 71.
- Jeremy sanctified in womb, i. 373. ii. 297.
- Jerome, St. accused by Julian of making Christ tell a lie, i. 157. his knowledge of Hebrew not grammatical, ii. 230.
- Jewish Monarchy consistent with the Law, i. 150.
- Joannes a S. Thomâ, mention of, ii. 250.
- Joannes Egeota, his opinion of the Council of Chalcedon, i. 169.
- John Baptist, grace of, in the womb a proof of Christ's grace, i. 231. 234. 374. ii. 260. unnecessary to go up to heaven for source of his grace, i. 235. 'none greater than, &c.' are words which do not exclude Mary or Christ, ii. 238. blessed by, and so less than, Mary, 24. i. greater than Jeremias, i. 373. rationality of, in the womb, 377, &c.
- John, St. commended from the Cross to Mary, i. 2. did for Mary at the Crucifixion what the Angel did for Christ in the Garden, ii. 78. 99. 102. his sweet dignity, 83. his office at the Cruci-

- fixion, 84-7. 90. none understand his Gospel without they have Mary for a Mother, (from Origen), 89. his Gospel the prime of all Scripture, *ibid.* representative of *all*, whom Jesus loves, at the Cross, 85. 91. may have had the care of the Blessed Sacrament in the Triduum, 100. and be a type to priests, *ibid.* may have been inspired to comfort Mary, 101-2. presence of, may have been required to lift the garment with Christ's Blood on it, 104. is Mary's private chaplain, *ibid.* *after* he had been made Mary's son, always calls himself 'the Disciple Jesus loved,' 149. praises Mary at the cost of his own humility, 150. durableness of Christ's love for, i. 316. his flesh supposed by some in heaven, i. 311. ii. 399. natural patron of chastity, i. 322. saw Mary in glory, ii. 391. why, 392. the Angels' reverence for him explained, 420.
- John Damascene, St. his hand restored by Mary, ii. 165.
- Jonas, not a prophet, unless allegorically understood, ii. 210. 226-7. 298. swallowed by a whale, strange story of, 298.
- Joseph, St. power of, with Christ, i. 204. q. ii. 28. 30. reason of his being allowed to doubt, i. 358. 386-8. Mary an oracle to, ii. 295. had the Angel sent to him as lord of the household, 14.
- Joseph of Arimathea, ii. 25.
- Josephus, character of, as an author, ii. 5. q.
- Josue, his stopping the sun, illustration from, ii. 202.
- Judas a type of sacrilegious communicants, ii. 103.
- Julian, (the Pelagian,) his visit to Theodore, i. 84. to Nestorius, 86. was the champion of Pelagian denial of original sin, 86. charges Augustine with giving Mary to the devil, ii. 283-6. his fallacy on the origin of evil, ii. 336. incestuous, i. 101. s.
- Julian (the apostate) objects to worship of Saints, ii. 183.

## K.

Knowledge, chiefly from comparison, i. 14.

## L.

- A Lapide quotes spurious works, ii. 18. t.
- Latin, defect of, ii. 224. c.
- Latria, Christ capable of, i. 195. 220. ii. 421. implies a raising of the mind to something invisible, i. 195. in Christ has similar difficulties to *Dulia* in, ii. 421-2. not to be given to Mary according to St. Epiphanius, 152. and St. Austin, 153-4. o. and St. Cyril, 183. see *Christ, Mary, Dulia*.
- Law of sin, items of. ii. 297. how interfered with, 297. 300.
- Laws, a lawgiver can grant exemptions from, ii. 246. but must not without authority be assumed to have done so, *ibid.*
- Lazarus, the poor received into the rich Abraham's bosom, i. 407.
- Leo, St. his view of St. Peter's power, i. 404. ii. 135.

Leontius, a convert from Nestorianism, i. 102. gives up the early Fathers to the Agnoetæ, i. 267.  
 Leporius, (i. e. Augustine) the first to deny explicitly that ignorance belonged to Christ, i. 267. d.  
 Light, the, which lighteneth every man, to what referred, i. 35. &c. of nature, 36-7.  
 Literalists, not partial to Mary, ii. 39. note. see *Allegory*.  
 Liturgies, all place Mary first in the Commemorantes, ii. 186. r. cannot have been forced on the whole world without a previous belief, 187. objection from, against worshipping Mary, 139. importance of, in answer, 185-9.  
 Lord, the term only applied to superior, i. 375. is equivalent in Elizabeth's mouth to Jehovah, i. 376. k.  
 Loretto, mysteries of the house of, ii. 33-4.  
 Lugo, St. Alphonso's character of him, ii. 410. h.  
 Lust, Manichean theory of, ii. 337. not from God, i. 196. c. see *Christ, Pelagianism*.  
 Lutheranism, Eutychian element of, ii. 340.

# M.

Magi, visit of, after the Purification, ii. 1.  
 Magnificat, fitly sung at the Visitation, i. 235. explanation of, 388-409. two principles for the right understanding of it, 389. thwarts Pelagius and Nestorius, 409. controversial use of, ii. 144. shews what sort of Gospel Mary would have written, 149. Anti-Pelagian, 171.  
*Μακαρῶν νῆσοι*, i. 317. n.  
 Manicheans think flesh the devil's work, ii. 311. confuse Dulia and Latria, ii. 153. controversy with, why a prelude to that on grace, 269.  
 Manicheism, opposed to Pelagianism, i. 166. real tendency of all heresies to, ii. 313, 316. as shewn by the sort of works in which Fathers point it out, 314. Satan's object in leading heretics towards, 314, 316, 321, 339. seems to explain the origin of evil, 314. main features of, 315. Dualism its animating principle, 316. which has nearly all Asia in its favour, 325. connection of, with Apollinarianism, 317. with Eutychianism, 319. with Arianism, 322. with Sabellianism, 327. with Nestorianism, 331. with Pelagianism, 335-8. elements of, in other heresies briefly noticed, 340. makes the Maternity unreal, 341. and the Immaculate Conception physically impossible, 342.  
 Marathon, honour paid to heroes of, compared to 'saint-worship,' ii. 183.  
 Marcellus of Ancyra, a Sabellian, ii. 328. his theory of absorption, 328. d.  
 Mark, St. his account of the appearance to the Magdalene considered, ii. 108-9. not in all Mss. 109. note.  
 Marriage, true doctrine of, not preached by Moses, ii. 158.  
 Martin, St. frayed Satan away by his asking for the wounds, ii. 101. q.  
 Martin I. St. anathematizes those who do not adore Mary, ii. 372.  
 Martyrs, worship of, ii. 154. 183. not prayed for, 186. see *Dulia*.

Mary of Egypt, her conversion,  
ii. 188. Magdalene, St. Ambrose thinks there were two,  
ii. 188.

Mary of the wine-press, ii. 100.  
p.

Mary of the baker's tools, ii.  
100. p.

Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, St.  
quotation from life of, ii. 35.

Mary, meaning and force of  
the name, ii. 145. d. *Considered doctrinally*, could not  
be more united to God with-  
out becoming God, i. 408.  
obtains all she asks, ii. 417.  
yet does not command her  
Son, 387. 416. but may re-  
ceive *Dulia* or religious vene-  
ration from him, 388. 408.  
difficulties in regard to this  
of the same nature as those  
in regard to *Latria*, 421.  
and requires the same dis-  
tinction to be made, *ibid.*  
(for Mary never *asked* her  
Son to pray for her, ii. 423.)  
as in the earthly veneration  
he paid to her, 414. the  
grounds of the heavenly to,  
here made to rest on the  
doctrine of

— Habits, i. 313-15. ii. 23.  
38. 90. which if not true,  
our faith in Christ's com-  
passion is baseless, i. 313.  
ii. 36. for Christ's obe-  
dience to, was of long  
duration, enough to form  
habits in himself towards  
her, i. 321. 351. 354. ii. 33.  
37. 44. 48. 51. 118. and in  
her towards himself, 36. 42.  
55. 64. 74.

— Needed a Saviour, i. 392-4.  
ii. 303. Maternity of, root  
of all her privileges, i.  
351-5. ii. 55. 64. caused  
by sin, i. 393-5. a personal  
gift, ii. 238. 245. Maternity

of, i. 363. ii. 9. 68-9. 89. d.  
90-9. 168, &c. 386. to us men  
formally given at the Cruci-  
fixion, 90. makes her the Mo-  
ther of all living, i. 400. ii. 68.  
89. 90, &c. her preeminent  
wisdom fits her to rule God  
on earth, 294-5. 354. and  
man and angels in heaven,  
i. 360. 364-369. ii. 372. 378.  
408. having the throne Satan  
had forfeited, i. 405. u. de-  
votion of her entire existence  
to obedience to the divine  
fitted her to govern the  
human will of Christ, ii. 292-5.  
354. her surprise no sign of  
ignorance, though she was  
not a comprehender, ii. 7.  
note i. 115. 387. nor her  
doubt at the Crucifixion of  
want of faith, 65. 77. 115.  
but rather of exact resem-  
blance to Christ, 66. 77-8.  
102. 137. y. for she was the  
promised seed, 280-3. the ex-  
pected Redemptrix, 68. 170.  
174-6. conceived without sin,  
219, &c. (see below, *Con-  
ception*.) and a Mother with-  
out the pangs of childbirth,  
i. 413. ii. 165.

— Needed no purification, 2.  
as Arians said, 3. having the  
fruitfulness commended by  
the Law, and the Virginity by  
the Gospel, i. 350. ii. 149.  
yet if viewed merely as a  
good woman, had vast op-  
portunities for growth in  
grace, i. 351, &c. ii. 55. her  
faith, i. 355. her power over  
Christ, ii. 42. 52. 61. her  
humility, i. 394-6. her mira-  
culous constancy at the  
Cross, ii. 72. 76, 77. her  
knowledge of Christ's policy,  
i. 355. ii. 52. her prudence,  
ii. 169. her ever-virginity,  
i. 362. 416. ii. 156. is above



all creatures, i. 269. ii. 372. 378. yet is not one hypostasis with Christ, 377. nor received in Communion, i. 390. t. but had a separate will, 392. whether Queen of Angels here, 360. 364-5. her daily Communions, ii. 122. why put in the back ground by Evangelists, 147.

— *Conception of*, a clue to all her privileges, ii. 219. such as may appear consistent at least, to those without, 220. may be used as a theory, which explains certain facts, 223-4. which shews (e. g.) why THE Virgin is spoken of by Isaias, i. 360. ii. 225. more easily than the text of Proverbs used by the Jews to explain the article, 226, &c. especially as several types occur of a female redeemer, 227-8. capable of reminding men of Eve's seed, 230. and explaining Gabriel's quotation from Judges, 235-6. is a personal gift, 237-8. and not against Scripture when making the Baptist first of all born of women, 238-40. but is favoured by the Scripture doctrine of predestination, 242. the Sapiential Books, 242-3. and the Genealogy of our Lord, 243-5. not contravened by texts where 'only,' 229. n. and 'all' are used, 245. 295.

— Opinion of the Church of former times on, 248. 253. 259. 266. deducible from probable grounds, 248. St. Thomas wrongly supposed to be certainly against it, 249-50. the body's preexistence serves as a prop for texts

seemingly against it, 251-2. which however are analogous to statements about our Lord, 252. f. is now universally believed, 253. 310.

— *Parable of*, the 'virgin earth,' at Frankfurt, 253-6. and by others east, 259. and west, 262. testimony of St. Austin to, 266. use of considering this, 269. St. A. exempts Mary from actual, and so from original, sin, 278-9. and flatly refuses to transfer her to the devil's book, 283-6.

— *Antecedent probability of*, 288. from results of, which fitted her to command Jesus on earth, 293-5. 354. does not destroy her need of a Saviour, i. 392. ii. 250. 303. Hatred of, by heretics, 308, &c. particularly by Manicheans, 342. but also by other heresies capable of a Manichean development, 343. Bearing of controversies on the Incarnation upon, 362, &c. see *Magnificat*.

— *Worship of*, may terminate in herself, ii. 409. chance that all the Church is right in, i. 4. existence of, puts protestants under some obligations, *ibid*. early notices of, defective, ii. 140. yet represented in a vision as practised by St. Paulinus of Lucca, in St. Peter's time, 189. and even carried early to an excess by some, 152. why not likely to lead Catholics to idolatry, i. 15. idle to object to the mere word, 7. proof of, in the fact that the Liturgies always put Mary first, ii. 186. Cyril reasonably suspected of, 185. is a help to understanding the Incarnation, i. 343. ii. 123.

- *Considered historically*: her knowledge and grace in St. Anne's womb, 293. 295. 357. never offended her parents, 173. but was early presented in the temple, 219. and made a vow of virginity, i. 349. questioned Gabriel, and why, ii. 169. gave her consent to the Incarnation, i. 364. gained graces of her Son in her womb, 355. and gave John grace in Elizabeth's, 368. &c. 377. and stayed there to continue the work she had begun, 385.
- *Magnificat* commented on, i. 388. a type of the Church, visiting the sick with the Blessed Sacrament, 406. and of good spirit's influence, ii. 195. her speech at the Nativity (from St. Ephrem), i. 428. Purification of, ii. 1. &c. her prudence in, 4. her surprise at Simeon's prophecy, 7. i. so much of as concerned her here explained, 8. 9. her journey to Egypt, its effect on idolatry, her twelfth passover with Jesus, i. 2. explanation of his conduct to them, 22-3. other instances of Christ's seeming coldness to, 37-42. her presence and supernatural conduct at the Crucifixion, 53. 59. 65. 72-77. obtains the thief's conversion, 75. 168. which explains why both blaspheme at first, 76. her feelings at the dividing of her Son's raiment, 79. Christ's first visit to. after the Resurrection, 114. Christ with *her* then probably at other times, 116. her life afterwards, 116. 122. taught the Evangelist facts, 148-50. her assumption into Heaven, 388. believed in soul at least early, 389. and might have been believed in body also, 396-8. is not 'de fide,' 399. seems necessary for Christ's honour, 400. and even happiness, 402. coronation of, 405. 413.
- *Objections to worship of*, 125. &c. from Scripture, 130. answers to, 143. &c. from types and prophecies of, which abound in Scripture, 146. (comp. i. 365. 416-22. ii. 16. 68. 227. 233.) silence of New Testament explained, 148-50. Scripture not being the whole of Revelation, 150. From *antiquity*, 131. general answer to, 157. from silence upon in practical works, 132. answer to, 163. from spuriousness of such as the Breviary cites, 133. answer to, 163. 174. from Chrysostom's mode of speaking, 135. observations upon, 178-9. and Leo's, 135. anticipated, i. 404. notes from the silence of Pseudo-Dionysius, ii. 136. observations upon, 180-1. and from that of St. Austin, 137. answer to, 173. 266-287. from the language of Cyril himself, 138. answered in notes, &c. 182-5. from the ancient Liturgies, 139. answer to, 158. &c. from the absence of invocations when they might be expected, 140. answer, 188-9. from the lateness of litanies, 140. see 187-8. See also *Latria, Dulia, Liturgies, &c.*
- Mass, sacrifice of, i. 8. 105. ii. 422.
- Materialism, closely allied to Manicheism, ii. 316. 1.
- Maternity, prior in order in the divine Mind to Mary's

- other gifts, i. 167. ii. 304. forcibly teaches the distinction of Persons in the Trinity, 359.
- Mediation, coincidence of infidel and protestant objection to, in creatures, i. 396. h. ii. 178. d. divergence of both from that of the Fathers, ii. 178. see *Dulia*.
- Mediator, Christ so in a 'high and peculiar sense,' i. 396.
- Meditation, dogmas necessary to, i. 14.
- Merit, human, an odious doctrine, i. 53, 54. f. men as Christians capable of, 58. in what sense ascribed to man, 59, l. 60. need of hypostatic union to obtain, 230. horrible doctrine of, 233. See *Christ, Mary, Pelagianism*.
- Metempsychosis, why invented, i. 54.
- Miracles, chapter on, ii. 190. 205. (see *Visions*.) Many will claim having done them at the Doom, 202.
- Monachism, thing in existence before the name, i. 351. m.
- Monica, St. her influence with St. Austin, i. 322. ii. 121. went to Mass every day, i. 105. prayer of, for St. Austin, *ibid.* ii. 120.
- Monophysitism, confusion by, of person and substance, ii. 336. z. 361. g. how opposed to the Immunity, 351.
- Monothelite controversy taught the world, that the nature of man (not its corruptions) was taken by Christ, ii. 366-369. that Mary's flesh was all pure, 367. and that this was correlative to a pure soul, 383. and that Christ had a will capable of obeying Mary, 369. followed in the wake of the Pelagian, 370.
- Monothelites agreed with ancient heretics, ii. 312. 364.
- Monothelitism, the link between Nestorianism and Manicheism, ii. 332. lay in denying that a separate will implied a separate nature, *ibid.* ascribes one compound operation to Christ, 333. in which it agrees with Nestorianism, *ibid.* and is anticipated by it, 334. bearing of on Pelagianism, 381-2. (see *Additions*, &c.) opposed to the Immunity, 355.
- Monstra te esse Matrem, monstrous view of, taken by protestants, ii. 386.
- 'Mother of God,' expresses the radical privilege conferred on Mary, i. 167. tells against Eutychianism as well as Nestorianism, *ibid.* this use of title pointed out by Cyril himself, 169. and made clear by Eusebius of Dorylæum, 170. is to the Incarnation what the Gloria Patri is to the Trinity, 172.
- Muratori opposed the Immunity, but under a feigned name, ii. 310.
- Mysteries gainsay our haughtiest faculties, i. 145.

N.

- Nativity of Christ, why the chief of the joyful mysteries, i. 410. miraculousness of, 414. See *Mary*.
- Nature, various senses of the word, i. 37. human, in which state Christ took it, 43. 284-89.



- Necessary matter, John of Salisbury's observation on, ii. 303. o.
- Negative, evidence sometimes of weight, ii. 134.
- Nestorianism, a branch of Pelagianism, i. 53. 233. ii. 307. 317. 339. i. 344. (see *Pelagianism*.) destroys the hypostatic union, i. 61, &c. makes human merit possible without the sacrifice of the Cross, 64, 70. involves a denial of the Real Presence in the Catholic sense, 67. confuted by St. Austin in writing against Pelagians, 68. is virtually against the Double Procession, 72. e. ii. 300. may exist formally in those who repudiate it, i. 91. its relation to the denial of Transubstantiation, 101. Leontius's testimony to this, 102. opposed to Eutychianism, 166. tends to Monothelitism, 187. to idolatry, 216. principally concerned with the state of Christ's body, 223. capable of a Manichean development through Monothelitism, 252. ii. 334. refuted in the *Magnificat*, i. 408. adopts Materialist theories of God, ii. 331. which connect it in some degree with Manicheism, 331. k. but its Monothelite, 332. and Pelagian tendencies in a greater, 335. its opposition to Mary's Immunity, 345-6. would make Mary's flesh as fit for communion as Christ's, i. 102. ii. 346. g. a most illogical heresy, i. 334. s. lowers Christ to the condition of others, 334. speaks heretically of his predestination, 132. ii. 334. v.
- Nestorians, their zeal in diffusing Theodore's works, i. 89. retained in their formularies, though not in practice, Catholic discipline, 92, 93. practical tendencies of, to Pelagianism, 93, &c. communicate 'in both kinds,' 110. confused notion of, on God's immateriality, 116. assert predestination of Christ resulted from prescience of his merits, 132. hypocritical profession of one person in Christ, 335. used Protopopos, not hypostasis, 335. ii. 364. d. use St. Thomas' exclamation distortedly, i. 357. t. retained old liturgies, ii. 187.
- Nestorius, his artfulness and tyranny, i. 81-5. preaches against Pelagians, but harbours them, 83. ii. 335. would hate the Immunity, ii. 308. why, 332. 344. affected to fear Catholics would make Mary a goddess, i. 82. 87. ii. 345. which in him was a reasonable fear, ii. 345. avoids calling the Word, Son, i. 160. known of to Cyril when he wrote on St. John, 162. makes Christ two sons, *ibid.* cannibal theory of the Eucharist, 193. a. anathematized those who give less power to the Man than to the Word, 193. d. makes two hypostases in Christ, 87. observations on his condemnation, *ibid.*
- Nicholas, St. mention of, ii. 297.
- Nicodemus, seems to have some knowledge of Christ before he came at sight, ii. 25. his disbelief of the Resurrection questionable, 114.
- Noris, Cardinal, Benedict XIV, defends him, i. 129. thought Vincent of Lerins wrote against Augustine, i. 131.



Nuns, born from Mary's Virginity, ii. 171, 172. recommended to follow Mary by St. Austin, 172. and St. Ambrose, 173.

## O.

Obedience, perfection of, i. 358. v. state of, chosen by Christ, ii. 47 50.

Objections, chapter on, ii. 126. use of, as touchstones, 130. devils could find them against the ablest doctors, 127. some always to be found who can answer them, 130. division of, *ibid.* see *Mary*.

Origen, Cyril's dislike of, i. 148. his preexistence, 185. condemnation of by St. Theophilus, 186. s.

## P.

Pachomius, St. his vision about the time of Easter, ii. 192.

Pain, our wondrous capacity for, ii. 21.

Pains of childbirth, &c. put in Paradise by Pelagians, ii. 336. a.

Pantheism, ii. 321, 325. See *Manicheism*.

Paradise of Pelagians, ii. 336. a. Mary's flesh compared with, 259.

Passions strong, not from God, i. 95, 96. c. ii. 306.

Passover, pilgrims to, travelled males and females apart, ii. 24, 28.

Patriarchs, their merit from Christ, i. 60. n. 407. prayers of, contributed to the Incarnation, 407.

Paulinus, St. of Nola, his observations on the sword which

passed through Mary's heart, ii. 137. y.

Paulinus, St. first bishop of Lucca, devout to Mary, ii. 189.

Pelagianism, connected with Nestorianism, i. 53, 88. 339. i. as Cassian, &c. point out, 64, &c. in three ways, 55. doctrinal connection why most important, *ibid.* branch of, which denies grace, closest to Nestorianism, 56. 88. hypothetical evasions used by, 56. makes Christ lustful, 57. 70. ii. 305. and the Instructor, not Redeemer, of man, i. 66. ii. 339. would make many Christs a possibility, i. 69, 70. makes Christ become by degrees fit for sacrifice, 70. 88. as does Nestorianism, *ibid.* both heresies imply a denial of God's power to pervade all substances, 71. (comp. ii. p. 331. k.) favoured the doctrine of the Single Procession, 72. was opposed by St. David, 78. m. texts cited against Nestorius at Ephesus tell against it, 88. actual tendencies to it in those who disclaim it, 92. makes lust natural, 100. makes Baptism useful, though not necessary, 107. refuted from the prayers of the Church, 101-6. from the exorcisms, 106-8. from infant communion, 109. may lead to a Quaternity, 194. g. refuted in the Magnificat, 408. ii. 171. lowers Christ and his predestination to the condition of others, ii. 334, 339. (comp. i. 132 b. 253.) its relations to Manicheism and Nestorianism, 335. particularly to the former, 336-38. notes, helps the Manicheans

- ibid. its zeal for the Im-munity not from its prin-ciples, 343. denied the exist-ence of the taint Mary was freed from, *ibid.* and as-serted of the pains, &c. ori-ginating from it, that they were in Paradise, 343-4.
- Pelagians, cleverness of, i. 83. s.
- Pelagius, an Irishman, accord-ing to the Benedictines, i. 78. m. made counsels of per-fection precepts, 96. argues well from absence of actual, to absence of original, sin, ii. 279-82. refuted by disproving Christ's human nature cor-rupted, 282. is a Bible Chris-tian, 283.
- Peter, St. his quotation from Joel considered, ii. 190. his vast power, i. 404. related to the mystery of his priest-hood, 404. s.
- Pharisees, converts mostly from, ii. 26.
- Plato, quoted by Cyril in de-fence of Dulia, ii. 184. alle-gories found in, 209. his account of the death-bed of the wicked, 267. e.
- Poets, lewd passages of, ex-plaind by allegory, ii. 208. d.
- Play on words, i. 401. m.
- Porphyry accuses Christ of changeableness, i. 157.
- Power subservient to Justice on the Cross, ii. 244. and to Mercy, to us words, *ibid.*
- Prayer of the Church proves her belief in grace, i. 103-4. for light upon the worship of Mary recommended, i. 16. ii. 129. 216.
- Prayers of the Saints predes-tined, i. 392.
- Predestination, subject of, how connected with Mary, i. 112. disputed points on, unneces-sary here, 113. ii. 290, 296.
- as part of revelation, must have its use, i. 113. disbelief in it ruinous to salvation, 114. open to similar diffi-culties with the doctrine of the Trinity, *ibid.* illustrated from God's omnipresence, 116. improperly applied to God at all, 117. yet neces-sarily, as in the case of his attributes, applied to him by mortals, *ibid.* is that part of Divine Providence which concerns the elect, 118. in-spires prayers, 392. and is illustrated by the difficulties in Providence, 119. inter-feres less than Fatalism with free-will, which itself should not interfere with it, *ibid.* Council of Trent forbids any man to take it to him-self, 120. if known, is not known as well as free-will, 120. so that predestination to be damned would not exempt from moral obliga-tions, 120. 124. Caietan's practical rule about, 121. q. John of Salisbury compares it to other mysteries, 121-2. St. Austin maintains it is to be preached, 123. and St. Ignatius cautions against preaching it to uneducated folk, *ibid.* difference between predestination as applied to the good, and to the bad, 124. meaning of double, 125. to damnation, how possible without predestination to sin, *ibid.* used of the reprobate, chiefly by protestants, 126. passages from Councils, &c. upon the subject, 126-7. Calvinistic theory of, unlike the Catholic, 128. leaves, and does not explain the mystery, *ibid.* which is paral-lel to other mysteries, *ibid.*

- fixes certain points, *ibid.*  
 grand difficulty of, felt when  
 attempted to be reconciled  
 with free-will, 121. 129. ii.  
 290. 296. Benedict the  
 XIV.'s Letter mentioning  
 three theories of, i. 129. may  
 be spoken of without enter-  
 ing on this difficulty, 129-30.  
 the writers before St. Austin  
 made it depend on pre-  
 science, 130. g. why little  
 spoken of, by Cyril, 185. why  
 spoken of by Nestorian in-  
 terlocutor in Cyril's dialogue,  
 187.
- Predestination of Christ*, i.  
 132. asserted in a wrong  
 sense by Nestorians, *ibid.*  
 text of Rom. i. relating to,  
 vindicated, 133-4. text of  
 Ps. xlv. apparently opposed  
 to, explained, 134-5. never  
 treated by St. Austin as an  
 objection, 135. passages from  
 other parts of Scripture, 136.  
 137. from Lugo, 137. and from  
 St. Austin on the subject,  
 138-44. the determining on  
 the existence of Christ, why  
 a part of predestination,  
 138. see *Nestorians*.
- Preexistence, why invented, i.  
 54. 185. (see *Cyril*.) of souls,  
 theory of, applied by Origen  
 to Christ, 186.
- Prejudice, impossible to read  
 Scripture without, i. 349.  
 need of authority to settle  
 which is a lawful, *ibid.*
- Prepossessions, or prejudices,  
 affect our judgment of the  
 plain meaning of Scripture,  
 ii. 49. fair minds will allow  
 for influence of, 50.
- Probability, argument from,  
 for the Immunity, ii. 289.
- Probable argument, use of, i.  
 13.
- Probable premisses never give  
 a demonstrative conclusion,  
 i. 248. z.
- Procession, double, ii. 330. de-  
 nied by Pelagians, i. 72. e. by  
 Theodorus, and probably by  
 Nestorians, *ibid.* why, *ibid.*  
 single, against foregoing doc-  
 trine, 32. u.
- Πρόσωπον, Nestorian use of, i.  
 335. ii. 364. d.
- Protestant, meaning of the  
 word with English Catholics,  
 i. 6. how far without and  
 how far with excuse, i. 8-10,  
 11, 12.
- Providence not tied to days and  
 hours, ii. 40.
- Prudentius, passage from, i.  
 404.
- Punishment, absence of, simply  
 accounted for by absence of  
 guilt, ii. 264. presence of,  
 no proof of that of guilt,  
*ibid.* a. greatness of, test of  
 the greatness of sin, 376. c.
- Purification, the, ii. 1, &c. use  
 of, not obvious, 2, 3.

## Q

Quality applied to the Holy  
 Ghost, i. 189. See *Cyril*.

Quaternity introduced by Nes-  
 torianism, i. 194. f. suspected  
 as a likely result of Pelagian-  
 ism, and Apollinarianism,  
 194. g. h.

## R.

Ram Mahun Rai took up with  
 Sabellianism, ii. 329. e.

Real Presence, how an Anti-Pe-  
 lagian doctrine, i. 103. practi-  
 cal proofs of this, 103-5. Cyril's  
 doctrine of, i. 214, &c. hea-  
 then calumny about, 217.  
 favoured by Nestorianism,

- ibid. force of on man, 219.  
 ii. 102, 103. visions relating to, ii. 193-4. nonsensical without Transubstantiation, i. 101.  
 heathen notion of at first, ii. 366.  
 Reason helps towards faith, i. 16. not contradicted, when enlightened, by mysteries, 22. 24, 25.  
 Reference or relation, principle of, i. 271. 274.  
 Reformation, early need of, ii. 390.  
 Relics, feeling of Christians to, exemplified in those at the foot of the Cross, ii. 79-81. Christ's regard for, 404.  
 Religion traditionary, ii. 159.  
 Repentance, Christ might mislead some by receiving baptism of, ii. 3.  
 Resurrection, proper proof of, to Jews from tradition, i. 415. ii. 290. our Lord's argument with Sadducees conclusive to them not to others, i. 415. Christ's, in *three* days hard to prove, ii. 298. h.  
 Rome, power of pagan, a prelude to power of Christian, i. 404.  
 Rosary, nature and object of, i. 343. as an idle repetition not encouraged by the Church, 334. a. prominence of Ave Maria's in, 344.  
 Rose, St. mention of, ii. 297.  
 Ruffinus, Pelagius's teacher, i. 78.  
  
 S.  
 Sabellianism, 'Person' and 'Nature' confused by, ii. 327. its theory of Incarnation favourable to Manicheism, ibid. Photinus and Marcellus belonged to, 328. other points in which it resembled Manicheism, ibid. is the opposite of Arianism, 327. 329. how opposed to the Immunity, 358. to Arianism, 359.  
 Sacrifice, the Christian, a safeguard against idolatry of creatures, i. 9. 15. Christian, not the body of Christ apart from his divine nature, 59. 60. 62.  
 Sacrifices, under the Gospel, i. 236. f.  
 Saints, blasphemed by the Beast, ii. 56. may be asked to pray Mary for us, i. 388. ii. 407. b. contempt of doing so from pride, i. 402. their concordant view of things, to be attended to, ii. 70. devotion to the way to understand their writings, i. 301. ii. 179. canonization of, process of mentioned, 126. will have new mode of knowing when their bodies are restored, i. 311. retain habits towards certain places, &c. 322. not united to God as Christ is, 40. 50. 52.  
 Sara, her age did not exempt her from concupiscence, ii. 237. t.  
 Satan, as much an angel as Michael, i. 37. 259. his throne left void for Mary, 405. u. his prey select, 180. wielded heresies methodically against the Church, ii. 362-5. did not know fully who Christ was, i. 164. ii. 263.  
 Saturday, holy, preface of, i. 182.  
 Scandals, referred to the flesh of Christ, meaning of, i. 157-8.  
 Schoolmen, Petavius alive to faults in some, i. 153. k.  
 Scotists, think Angels saved by Christ's merits, i. 393. c. the majority of theologians against this, ibid.



- Scribes, sent by Christ, ii. 26.
- Scripture, as a whole, favours Church teaching, i. 234. ii. 143.
- Seed, the promised, is Mary, ii. 229-33.
- Semiarrianism, opposed to the Immunity, ii. 354-8.
- Severus, the Monophysite doctor disciple of Nestorius, ii. 333.
- Sexes, both honoured by the Incarnation, ii. 270.
- Sfondrati, his 'work on St. Thomas's view of the Immunity, ii. 249. a.
- Simeon, not a priest, ii. 6. prophecy of, explained, 7-12. controversial use of, ii. 145.
- Simonides, his cutting saying against the Corinthians, ii. 360. application of, 361.
- Sin, denial of its existence by some, ii. 307. greatness of, ascertainable by greatness of punishment, 376. c. propagation of original, justifiable, 375: z. allowable to lead a man from greater by a less, i. 265. absence of all actual, proof of absence of original, ii. 278-80. original, used by David to abase himself, i. 35. solitary exemption from, proves the rule of, 55. strongly stated by St. Cyril, 173-5. Cyril's testimonies to, 63. 88. 173. &c. effects of, destroyed in the soul of Christ, 47.
- Slavery, 'use it rather,' applies to, ii. 49. b.
- Solidity, a relative term, i. 414. d.
- Soul, none as high as Christ's, i. 269. ii. 387.
- Soul, distinguished from spirit, i. 392. yet not as a separate subsistence, ii. 318. theories of the date of its origin, i. 368. b. c. ii. 250. d. state of St. John Baptist's, i. 371. &c. theory of its post-existence, 368. b. c. not an ancient one, *ibid.* yet useful in discussing the Immunity, ii. 250. 278. might, if freed from original sin, organize the body faster, i. 370. individually related to its own body, 371. f. ii. 376. b.
- Speculative distinction, principle of, i. 273, 274. 276.
- Spirit, Holy, see *Christ, Mary, Procession.*
- Spirit and soul, distinction of, i. 392. ii. 318.
- Stones, Christ could have created children to Abraham from, i. 400.
- Subjection, implies submission of will to another, 32-45. of Jesus to Mary, ii. 30. possibility of, explained, 32-3. cases of imagined, 33-4.
- Submission to a superior, is submission to an individual creature's will, ii. 45.
- Suffering, opportunities of given to Mary, ii. 35. not the end of Christ's coming, *ibid.* m.
- Συνέσις, ii. 26.
- Superior, Mary was to Christ, ii. 46. observations on choice of, 45-6.
- Sword through Mary's heart, ii. 137. See *Mary, Simeon.*

## T.

- Ταυροβουλία, the symbol of Nestorianism, i. 253. ii. 252. 332.
- Tertullian, a Materialist, i. 148. c.
- Testament, New, why so silent about Mary, ii. 148.
- Testament, Old, Jewish division of, ii. 226. sanctioned

- by Christ, *ibid.* full of types, &c. of Mary, 146. proofs for Immaculate Conception chiefly from, 246.
- THE, in Isaias's prophecy, treatment of, ii. 224.
- Themistius, belonged to a Eutychian school, i. 255, 256. but founded a heresy (of the Agnoetæ) of a Nestorian character, 255-7.
- Theodoret, allows the eastern gate may mean Mary, i. 418. heretical passage from, 325. compared with Felix of Urgela, 326. f. opinions on, 335, notes. uses Nestorian evasions, 335. once a heretic, 77. g. 335. r.
- Theodorus, his Christ advanced in grace, i. 69. ii. 346. e. f. and struggled against internal temptations, i. 70. denied the Double Procession, 72. e. and so is defended by Zernicau, *ibid.* is the founder of Pelagianism and Nestorianism, 75, &c. his works, 75. 85. one against St. Austin, 76. Syriac and other versions of, 76. c. 89. s. regarded as authoritative by Nestorians, 89. and as such disseminated by them, 80. was condemned after death, 76. e. 77. 85. 86. 232. denied mortality was the result of the fall, 77. i. was Nestorius's teacher, 79. cunning of, 80, 81. hated allegory, 81. p. his life and conversation, 81. Julian's visit to him, 84. Pelagius II. opinion of him, 85. his atrocious saying, 70. b. 110. his theory of the fall of Angels, ii. 337. b. of Christ's progress in grace, 346. e. made Christ ignorant, i. 254.
- Theology, ancient sense of the word, i. 280, 281.
- Theory, probably true when it explains many facts, ii. 223.
- Theotocos, a note of the Church, ii. 156. 162. see *Mother of God*.
- Thief, penitent, his early life, ii. 15. his conversion attributed to Mary, 15. 75. 168.
- Thomas, St. said to have opposed the Immaculate Conception, ii. 248. was a great follower of St. Austin, 249. real evidence that his works have been corrupted, 250. did not know of St. Austin's *Opus Imperfectum*, 268. 286. at first rejected the theory of experimental knowledge, i. 303.
- Three Chapters, controversy of, i. 77. made men forward in denying an opposition of wills in Christ, ii. 381.
- Time, notions of, derived from space, i. 115. e.
- Tongues, gift of, only indirectly prophesied of in Joel, ii. 190.
- Transfiguration, possible at the Nativity, i. 422-4. Cyril's view of it, 217.
- Transubstantiation, St. Austin's expression of, i. 58. k. see *Real Presence*, and *Nestorianism*.
- Trinitarian controversy, principles used in, paved the way for others, i. 29. ii. 363.
- Trinity, Scripture seems to make three Gods in, i. 276. name rarely used in early times, ii. 159. controverted text on, in St. John's Epistle, 134. conceived through the working of man's mind, 296. statements about paved the way for those about the Incarnation, i. 29. one will in, ii. 353.
- Tyre and Sidon, not preached to, though convertible, ii. 158.

## U.

- Unction from the holy, leads to knowledge, i. 152.  
 Understanding, subsequent to faith, i. 23-4.  
 Union, hypostatic differs from that with the Saints, i. 49. 50. see *Christ*.  
 Unitarianism, Pantheistic leanings of, ii. 321.  
 Unscriptural, foolish sense of, ii. 160.  
 'Untainted,' &c. used of Mary by Anti-monothelite writers, ii. 367-9. why, 377. 383.  
 'Until,' use of, i. 361. x. 362. d.

## V.

- Vincent of Lerins, Card. Noris thought his 'quod semper quod, &c.' directed against St. Augustine, i. 131.  
 Virgin, tradition of among the heathen, ii. 233. n. see *Mary*.  
 Visions, the past not shewn in, some thought, ii. 389-90. John's of Mary, 391-3. Scripture says nothing against their existence, 202. Nebuchodonosor's ridiculous, if not judged by the analogy of the faith, 203. miracles admit of being brought under the same rules as, 205-6. idle to object that they constitute a new revelation, 15. 203-5. used by St. Paul to prove our religion, 214. so may though insufficient for proving a dogma, yet be enough for proving the Church to be such, 191. miracles and allegory in this respect similar to, 191. 200. 202. 205. 206. shewn to be believed to exist by the Fathers, 191-9. and in prophecy, 191. and by the pro-

mised gift of discerning spirits, 202. disbelieved by the apostate Julian, 193. and by Celsus, 196. St. Anthony gives rules about them, 194-5. reflections on the bearing of this belief on the opinion the Fathers would have of Mary now, 198. weight to be given them in proving doctrine, 199. evidence from concurrent testimony of, of the same nature as that from texts of Fathers, 199, 200. when written, chiefly by women, 201. remarks on, *ibid*.

- Vision, beatific, denied by Nestorians, i. 71. d. Mary had it not, ii. 387. b. in Christ, all but absolutely de fide, i. 231. 338. see *Christ*.  
 Visitation of our Lady, i. 368.  
 Vow of virginity made by Mary noticed, i. 349. such spoken of by St. Paul, 351. m.

## W.

- Will, the, upright at first, i. 42. separate, implies a separate nature, ii. 332. see *Monotheism*. in Trinity one, 353. in Christ two, *ibid*. yet not opposite, *ibid*.  
 Word, the, not Priest apart from his flesh, i. 62. as Nestorians seem to think, 63.  
 Wordsworth, pantheistic simile from, ii. 325. n.  
 Wickliffism is Manichean, ii. 340.

## Z.

- Zacharias, St. John Baptist's father, slain between the temple and the altar, ii. 5. St. Jerome's opinion against, objected to, *ibid*.  
 Zernicau referred to, i. 32. u.





## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

### VOL. I.

- Page 42. n. q. *for* cap. 2. *read* chap. iv. §. 8.  
 55. *for* and even of God *read* and even need God  
 100. transpose ref. to note o from Mary *to* to call natural  
     insert ref. to p after concupiscence  
 129. *for* Romanists *read* Dominicans  
 138. add ref. to Lugo de Incarn. disp. xxxiii. §. 1. n. 3.  
 162. n. a. *for* before similar *read* before, do similar  
 189. n. c. It should be added, that there is a passage in his work  
     against Apollinaris, ap. Mai Coll. N. viii. p. 70. going  
     seemingly the other way, which I had forgotten at the  
     time, and cannot well discuss here.  
 217. cut off note t from end of s, and supply new reference from  
     Transfiguration to the present note t.  
 222. n. d. *for* the end of chap. xiii. *read* xiv. §. 13.  
 223. *for* fulness *read* fitness.  
 265. Supply reference z at of Christ, and a at Divine Nature.  
 336. n. v. *for* no one *read* no ancient authority. This meaning  
     appears from the context, but I should be sorry even to  
     seem disrespectful to Baronius.  
 337. n. f. *for* habebant *read* habebunt  
 371. n. f. *for* chap. v. *read* chap. vii. §. 9.  
 382. *for* he who was *read* she who was  
 394. note. The following words of Lugo escaped me when I wrote  
     this note, Disp. vii. §. 1. fin. 'Facilius et conformius ad  
     mentem sanctorum Patrum dicimus Deum *post* prævisionem  
     absolutam peccati decrevisse Incarnationem Verbi in reme-  
     dium peccati.'

### VOL. II.

- Page 32. *for* man and had free will to choose *read* man and had free will,  
 33. *for* imaginary ones, *read* cases, *for* §. 10. *read* 11.  
 100. this (of St. John) is somewhere asserted by Sister Emerich,  
     which should have been noticed.  
 150. fin. 13. The silence *dele break*  
 220. n. a. *for* Triart, *read* Iriart,  
 239. It should have been noticed, that in Gal. iv. 4. some Mss. have  
     γεννώμενον *for* γενόμενον, which weakens the assertion in  
     the text. In Matt. xi. it is γεννητοῖς.  
 260. to *soul* add reference to St. Sophronius, p. 367.  
 263. Suarez, in pt. iii. vol. 2. p. 70. Sed non videtur &c. treats of this  
     tradition. But the distinct application of the Immaculate  
     Conception to explain it, appears to me to put it in a clearer  
     light (if I may say so) than is there done.  
 317. and 334. *for* Monophysitism *read* Monothelitism  
     A similar mistake occurs in 379, 381, 382. See chap. v. §. 20.  
     and 21. which will shew how it arose.  
 367. add reference to St. James of Sarug. p. 260.









1.1

MORRIS, J.B.	BQT
	696
Jesus the Son of Mary.	.M6
	v.2
DATE	ISSUED TO

MORRIS, J.B.  
 Jesus the Son of Mary.

BQT  
 696  
 .M6  
 v.2.

